

technologies which have been proving themselves.

An additional cut of \$33.4 million in the EERE account would further weaken these new technologies. And I will guarantee you that the technologies are so valuable that the Russians and the Chinese are hacking into these companies repeatedly because of their importance to the future, and they recognize where the future is headed. And we have got a real job on our hands to hold on to these technologies because of that and because of their market manipulation.

China is a great market manipulator. She has a state-run economy, and it is not fair. If they can't steal the technology directly—if you invest over there and you take your technology there, they steal your IT there.

□ 2100

So just since 2003, our country has spent \$2.6 trillion importing foreign petroleum. When you think about the importance of America being energy independent here at home, coal, clean coal, has a role to play in that, but these new technologies have a major role to play as well. We all support a diverse energy portfolio to eliminate our reliance on imported energy—some would say addiction to imported energy. We have been breaking that addiction.

We should be advancing technology to clean up fossil energy, yes, and this bill already does that with sufficient funding to the fossil energy accounts. Our country should be leading investment in these technologies, not just for our own energy security, but also for economic opportunities and the jobs that this expanding market is already providing us.

We can't really afford to cede this market to any other country in the world, and I oppose this amendment and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, let me just close quickly by saying we are not talking about West Virginia. We are talking about all across the country. These laboratories are located in colleges and universities all across America.

Coal is something that is expanding. Our exports are up 58 percent. People around the world are going to use coal. I think it is the responsibility for us to show them how to burn it cleanly. China is going to increase their use by 43 percent. India is going to double its consumption in that same timeframe.

When you compare the amount of research, only 18 percent currently of all the Federal dollars for research is in fossil fuel, but 56 percent is in renewable. That is not balanced.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WEBER of Texas) having assumed the chair, Mr. DONOVAN, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3219) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3219, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2018, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-261) on the resolution (H. Res. 478) providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3219) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 473 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3219.

Will the gentleman from New York (Mr. DONOVAN) kindly resume the chair.

□ 2104

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3219) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes, with Mr. DONOVAN (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 42 printed in House Report 115-259, offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 43 OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 43 printed in House Report 115-259.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 286, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$15,000,000)”.

Page 296, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$15,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 473, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to begin by thanking the chairman of the full committee for his extraordinary work and for the chairman of the subcommittee for this auspicious opportunity.

I have been listening to the arguments recently that we have had on the floor regarding the most recent amendments between fossil fuels and renewables, and I am hoping to strike a sweet spot here. I am not picking on fossil fuels, and I am going to talk about a renewable that I think everybody has an affinity for and an agreement with.

This amendment simply increases funding for hydroelectric through the EERE by \$15 million and decreases funding to the bureaucracy. There is no increase to the budget. This amendment just increases the appropriation for the Office of Energy and Efficiency and Renewable Energy because hydropower is available in every region of the country; 2,200 hydropower plants provide America's most abundant source of clean, renewable electricity. I would say it is the first renewable. It accounts for 67 percent of domestic renewable generation and, clearly, 7 percent of total electricity generation.

By 2025, hydropower would create almost a million and a half new, good, high-paying jobs. It can be implemented in rivers, harbors, coastal areas, et cetera, to capture energy from currents and tides. Harnessing this energy will create a truly and absolutely renewable and green source of energy without any emissions and with little fanfare to everybody involved.

Hydro is predictable year-round power output, while other renewable source outputs can be variable in some areas and necessitate the use of large battery banks and alternate power sources. For instance, sometimes when the wind doesn't blow, believe it or not, if you don't know it, there is a gas-fired generator often associated with those windmill farms that has to come on because base load isn't being serviced.

Hydropower facilities are quiet, unobtrusive, while many people report that considerable noise is generated by wind power and that land is taken up by huge solar farms.

Hydropower is base load energy. That means it is on all the time, 24 hours a day, 365 days a year, just sitting there turning out the power so that you can hit the light switch when you come home and not wonder: Is the power going to be on? It backs up other intermittent sources of energy.

Hydropower is safe. It harms neither fish nor man. It all faces a comprehensive and regular regulatory approval process.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. I claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of Mr. PERRY's amendment and the power and potential of clean marine hydrokinetic energy, and I first want to thank Chairman SIMPSON and Ranking Member KAPTUR for their leadership in supporting the Water Power Technologies Office. The Water Power Technologies Office invests in research and development that supports hydropower, pumped storage, and marine energy.

Furthermore, I want to thank the chair and ranking member for including \$30 million in the 2017 omnibus for the creation of a wave energy test center, which is now located at Oregon State University. This robust investment will help the United States lead in the field of marine hydrokinetic energy. The increase this amendment proposes will support hydropower and the development of innovative hydropower technologies, along with marine and hydrokinetic energy technologies. Development of these new technologies can offer the United States leadership in an emerging area of abundant renewable energy.

Marine and hydrokinetic energy, in particular, energy from waves, currents, and tides, is an exciting frontier in the renewable energy sector. Currently, Oregon State University, University of Washington, and the University of Alaska Fairbanks are partnering to support the testing and research activities of the Northwest National Marine Renewable Energy Center. This center will provide visionary entrepreneurs with a domestic location to test wave energy devices, along with other technologies, rather than traveling to Scotland to use the European test center. Without continued Federal investment, Europe will remain the leader in this important work.

When fully developed, wave and tidal energy systems could generate a significant amount of total energy used in the United States. As Congress promotes technologies that can help lower our constituents' energy bills, we must explore new and innovative solutions like marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy.

Thank you again to the chairman and ranking member for their hard work and legislative leadership on this issue, and thank you to Representative PERRY for his leadership.

Mr. Chair, I urge support for this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, a lot of what we hear is that our constituents wish that we would work together more often, and I thank the gentlewoman for her comments and her support; and I think it is just proof that we can work together for something that we agree on, which is clean power, the power to just power our future, and that comes from hydroelectricity.

I don't know why it is not as sexy as it should be. I think it is one of the greatest marvels of technology starting back since the beginning of time and when power was first generated, and I don't understand why we don't rely on it more.

To that end, literally 60,000 megawatts of preliminary permits and projects await final approval and are pending before FERC in 45 States right now. Eighty thousand—80,000—nonpowered dams in the United States, of which 600 have immediate hydro capability, right now could be producing energy.

Mr. Chair, 80,000 nonpowered dams in the United States, just think about that. And the State I hail from and I am privileged to represent a portion of, Pennsylvania, has 678 megawatts of untapped hydropower right now.

Mr. Chairman, I would just urge all of our colleagues to vote for this amendment.

I, again, appreciate the chairmen of the committee and of the subcommittee for this opportunity, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the remaining time, please.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman has 2½ minutes remaining.

Ms. BONAMICI. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE), a strong supporter of hydropower.

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much to my colleague from Oregon for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I, too, want to rise in support, today, of the Perry amendment.

I thank my colleague from Oregon and my colleague from Pennsylvania for their leadership on this important renewable energy issue.

I also want to thank the chair of the subcommittee, Mr. SIMPSON, whom I am fortunate to also serve on the Interior Committee with. Mr. SIMPSON has worked hard on this bill to increase some of the levels of funding above the abysmal levels that were proposed by the administration's budget earlier this year.

And also, to our ranking member, Ms. KAPTUR, my friend from Ohio, I thank her for her commitment to renewable energy and our energy future.

The amendment before us today would provide a modest increase in funding to the Department of Energy's Water Power Program. It is a bipartisan effort, and I am pleased to be part of that. It comes from the fact that many parts of the country are seeking

the real benefits of tidal energy that generates incredible power, or of hydrokinetic power that taps the power of flowing water.

In response to my colleague from Pennsylvania, in Maine, we think tidal energy is very sexy.

The Department of Energy supports private sector research, development, and implementation of hydropower, pumped storage, and marine tidal energy. It supports cutting-edge research and makes sure that the office supports all three types of water-based technologies.

Last year, nearly 100 teams competed in a competition for an Energy Department-funded wave energy prize, with 20 finalists coming from 10 States, showing the breadth of interest in this work. Congress needs to support multifaceted work at a level that will continue to allow for innovation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all my colleagues to support renewable energy, support water power, and support the Perry amendment.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support this amendment and encourage all of you to do the same.

As the sponsor of the amendment explained, this does not take additional money, cuts down on bureaucracy, and puts the dollars into important work, like marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 2115

AMENDMENT NO. 44 OFFERED BY MS. ESTY OF CONNECTICUT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 44 printed in House Report 115-259.

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 286, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$20,000,000)".

Page 288, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$40,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 473, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment to increase funding for the Advanced Manufacturing Office by \$20 million.

I want to thank my colleagues, Representative TOM REED, JOHN KATKO, and JACKY ROSEN for their partnership in this bipartisan amendment.

Our amendment is about protecting and creating millions of good-paying

jobs in Connecticut and across the country. Our amendment will help us ensure that the technologically advanced products of the future will be manufactured, not in China, not in India, but right here in the United States of America.

The Department of Energy's Advanced Manufacturing Office is the only technology development office within the Federal Government that is dedicated to enhancing American manufacturing competitiveness. The Advanced Manufacturing Office works to help manufacturers improve energy and material efficiency, technology, and productivity.

Unfortunately, the appropriations bill before us today cuts funding to the Advanced Manufacturing Office by \$155.5 million from fiscal year 2017 enacted levels, and that is a mistake.

Manufacturing is one of the most important sectors of the U.S. economy. In 2016, manufacturing contributed \$2.18 trillion to our economy and employed 12.3 million workers. In my home State of Connecticut, manufacturing has long been our economic backbone.

Connecticut is home to nearly 5,000 manufacturing companies that provide good-paying jobs for 76,000 Connecticut residents. This amendment helps American manufacturers all across the country to be more competitive by reducing energy costs.

Manufacturing is very energy intensive. In fact, according to the National Association of Manufacturers, manufacturers consume more than 30 percent of our Nation's energy. That translates to \$130 billion in costs to U.S. manufacturers every year.

Adequately funding the Advanced Manufacturing Office, will help reduce energy costs to manufacturers, freeing up their budgets to invest in research and development, expand their facilities, and, most importantly, hire more people.

Our amendment also helps American manufacturers become more competitive by addressing critical workforce needs in energy efficiency.

Last year, I visited Forum Plastics, a plastic molding company based in Waterbury, Connecticut. I met with employees to discuss the expectations and challenges facing manufacturers in America today, and one of the topics that came up was how businesses struggle to hire workers with the right skills. Yet, that same year, Forum Plastics partnered with the Advanced Manufacturing Office to carry out an industrial assessment project.

The Industrial Assessment Centers program is a tool for employers to recruit individuals with hands-on experience in energy efficiency.

Mr. Chairman, now is not the time to roll back investments in American manufacturing. It is the time to increase our support for U.S. manufacturing. I know all of us in this Chamber are committed to promoting good-paying jobs in the communities we represent, but it is not enough to say we are committed.

We need to make job creation a priority, and that means making American manufacturing a priority. I urge my colleagues to support our amendment which increases funding to the Department of Energy's Advanced Manufacturing Office by \$20 million, fully paid for by a reduction in the more than \$350 million plus-up to funding for the Office of Fossil Energy Research & Development.

This bipartisan amendment is a win for American manufacturing and a win for our economy. I urge my colleagues to support our bipartisan amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chair, first, let me say, it was not a \$300-some-odd-million plus-up in the fossil energy research. In fact, I think the fossil energy research account was down from last year.

It was more than the President requested, but it is not a plus-up from what it was in 2017.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. The amendment would increase funding for the Energy Efficiency & Renewable Energy by \$20 million but has to use \$40 million from the Fossil Energy Research & Development account as an offset.

This bill was the result of some tough choices. I have to admit, they were some tough choices. It is not that I oppose the program that the good lady advocates for, but there were some tough choices. We had to prioritize research and development that will increase our energy independence.

Our domestic energy resources are vast, and this bill strikes a balance to lay the foundations for future energy generation technologies, while maintaining full support for the resources we use most today.

Increasing funding for EERE by diverting funding from fossil energy strikes the wrong balance when considering the Nation's electricity needs. Fossil fuels produce 65 percent of the electricity we use today and will continue to provide the majority of the Nation's energy needs in the future.

This amendment would reduce funding for a program that ensures that we use our Nation's fossil fuel resources as well, and as cleanly as possible. For all of the reasons that team fossil talked about earlier tonight, I must oppose the amendment and urge my Members to do the same.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman has 30 seconds remaining.

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut. Mr. Chair, again, I urge my colleagues to support this. If we can help our manufacturers be more efficient in their use of energy, we can help them be more competitive,

hire more people, and develop that clean energy technology for coal.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut will be postponed.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 46 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 49 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 49 printed in House Report 115-259.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 296, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000) (increased by \$1,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 473, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, in these difficult times, I want to thank the chairman and ranking member, Chairman SIMPSON and Ranking Member KAPTUR of the subcommittee, for shepherding this legislation to the floor, and for their efforts, and the commitment that we all have to preserving America's great natural environment and resources so that they can serve and be enjoyed by generations to come.

My amendment increases funding for the DOE departmental administration by \$1 million, which should be used to enhance the Department's Environmental Justice program activities.

The Environmental Justice program is an essential tool in the effort to improve the lives of low-income and minority communities, as well as the environment at large. Twenty years ago, this particular program was established directing Federal agencies to identify and address the disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of their actions on minority and low-income populations.

So we have engaged with Historically Black Colleges, minority-serving institutions, Tribal colleges, and other organizations to improve and develop the sustainability through developing

young people and faculty to work on these important issues.

The crisis in Flint, Michigan, teaches us how important it is that minority groups and low-income communities are not placed at a disadvantage when it comes to environmental threats and hazards like lead in drinking water or nesting areas for mosquitos carrying the Zika virus. I particularly remember convening a Zika task force in Houston to ensure that areas in my community, because of the sitting water and a lot of heat, did not breed these mosquitos to create a devastating condition in some of our communities.

This Environmental Justice program is extremely important, involving community education and advisory projects, community capacity building through technology, the Community Leaders Institute, but, more importantly, it works on important research.

Mr. Chair, might I find out how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman has 2½ minutes remaining.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I want to make note of the fact that in some of the universities that participate in this program, the chairs—meaning the faculty chairs—are a team of world-class scholars, researchers, and educators from 14 Historically Black Colleges and Universities, one Hispanic-serving institution, who advance research, enhance academics, promote partnerships, and effect outreach in the environmental sciences.

Finally, the Minority Serving Institutions Program that includes a wide array of institutions provides funding to minority-serving institutions to advance scientific research, student internships, faculty fellowships, and curriculum development.

Mr. Chair, the more we can invest in science and research, helping to improve our environment—and let me make it very clear, in urban and rural areas. This is not an urban program only. It is urban and rural areas. The more we can help our communities be clean and environmentally safe and secure, the more we create a better quality of life for all people, no matter what their economic station in life or where they live.

Mr. Chair, I want to thank Chairman SIMPSON and Ranking Member KAPTUR for shepherding this legislation to the floor and for their commitment to preserving America's great natural environment and resources so that they can serve and be enjoyed by generations to come.

My amendment increases funding for DOE departmental administration by \$1,000,000 which should be used to enhance the Department's Environmental Justice program activities.

Mr. Chair, the Environmental Justice Program is an essential tool in the effort to improve the lives of low income and minority communities as well as the environment at large.

Twenty years ago, on February 11, 1994, President Clinton issued Executive Order

12898, directing federal agencies to identify and address the disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of their actions on minority and low-income populations.

A healthy environment sustains a productive and healthy community which fosters personal and economic growth.

Maintaining funds for environmental justice that go to Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Minority Serving Institutions, Tribal Colleges, and other organizations is imperative to protecting sustainability and growth of the community and environment.

The funding of these programs is vital to ensuring that minority groups are not placed at a disadvantage when it comes to the environment and the continued preservation of their homes.

The crisis in Flint, Michigan teaches us how important it that minority groups and low-income communities are not placed at a disadvantage when it comes to environment threats and hazards like lead in drinking water or nesting areas for mosquitos carrying the Zika virus.

Through education about the importance of environmental sustainability, we can promote a broader understanding of science and how citizens can improve their surroundings.

Funds that would be awarded to this important cause would increase youth involvement in STEM fields and also promote clean energy, weatherization, clean-up, and asset revitalization. These improvements would provide protection to our most vulnerable groups.

This program provides better access to technology for underserved communities. Together, the Department of Energy and Department of Agriculture have distributed over 5,000 computers to low income populations.

The Community Leaders Institute is another vital component of the Environmental Justice Program. It ensures that those in leadership positions understand what is happening in their communities and can therefore make informed decisions in regards to their communities.

In addition to promoting environmental sustainability, CLI also brings important factors including public health and economic development into the discussion for community leaders.

The CLI program has been expanded to better serve Native Americans and Alaska Natives, which is a prime example of how various other minority groups can be assisted as well.

Through community education efforts, teachers and students have also benefitted by learning about radiation, radioactive waste management, and other related subjects.

The Department of Energy places interns and volunteers from minority institutions into energy efficiency and renewable energy programs. The DOE also works to increase low income and minority access to STEM fields and help students attain graduate degrees as well as find employment.

Since 2002, the Tribal Energy Program has also funded 175 energy projects amounting to over \$41.8 million in order to help tribes invest in renewable sources of energy.

With the continuation of this kind of funding, we can provide clean energy options to our most underserved communities and help improve their environments, which will yield better health outcomes and greater public awareness.

We must help our low income and minority communities and ensure equality for those who are most vulnerable in our country.

I ask my colleagues to join me and support the Jackson Lee Amendment for the Environmental Justice Program.

Mr. Chair, I ask my friends and my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 50 OFFERED BY MS. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM OF NEW MEXICO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 50 printed in House Report 115-259.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 297, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$98,000,000) (increased by \$98,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 473, the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Mexico.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Chair, my amendment ensures that NNSA has adequate work space to fulfil its national security mission. In my home State of New Mexico, over 1,000 Federal and contract employees at NNSA currently work in a network of old and rapidly deteriorating facilities on Kirtland Air Force Base in New Mexico.

A portion of the existing facility includes a 60-year-old former military barracks, which creates a number of health, safety, and quality-of-life issues for its employees. These employees are involved in some of our Nation's most important national security work, including managing our Nation's nuclear deterrent and reducing global nuclear and radiological threats.

The NNSA administrator, Lieutenant General Klotz, said that:

The highly talented employees in Albuquerque are frankly forced to work in facilities that are inadequate to NNSA's current mission.

Furthermore, because of the age of the buildings, NNSA is forced to spend approximately \$6 million every year on maintenance and repairs just to keep them habitable.

In fact, the \$40 million worth of deferred maintenance alone on the old buildings is approximately one-fifth of what it would cost to build a new, modern, and reliable facility. So this is a perfect opportunity to save money in the long run.

I strongly support NNSA's efforts to replace the existing complex with a single new building that will provide

safe, reliable, and sustainable infrastructure that improves the safety and working environment for approximately 1,200 employees.

The new state-of-the-art facility will meet enhanced environmental standards and consolidate staff for a more efficient delivery and support of the important national security work at NNSA.

□ 2130

The current total project cost is \$202 million, and I agree with Chairman SIMPSON that we have an obligation to ensure that every single taxpayer dollar for this project is used efficiently and effectively.

I know that the chairman shares my concerns to ensure that NNSA has the infrastructure and resources it needs to fulfill its national security mission now and in the future. That is why I am pleased that he has agreed to work with me on this issue to ensure that we are fulfilling our oversight responsibilities while moving the construction of the Albuquerque complex project forward.

With that, I am prepared to withdraw my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentlewoman's concern and thank her for her advocacy for this project.

The committee has been supportive of this project and has provided \$42 million in prior years. The bill includes an additional \$18 million to ensure that the project moves forward, and I am happy to work with her as the project advances and understand this amendment will be withdrawn, and I appreciate that.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the chairman's words and respect his work prior to this and in this current effort to get this space and the facility infrastructure issues addressed. I look forward to working with him on a variety of ideas to make sure that we get this project completed in a timely and effective manner.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time, and I withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 51 OFFERED BY MR. FOSTER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 51 printed in House Report 115-259.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 297, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$10,000,000) (increased by \$10,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 473, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is a symbolic adjustment to the NNSA budget intended to raise awareness about two areas of emerging national security risk that I believe deserve more attention and investment.

As the only Ph.D. physicist in Congress, I feel a special responsibility to speak out on issues of national security, especially when they concern emerging technological threats that Congress may not be sufficiently aware of.

Any student of the history of warfare is well aware of the dangers of fighting the last war, and for more than 70 years, nuclear weapons have held center stage among threats to our national security and global safety because of their unique capabilities to threaten the existence of mankind. That threat remains, but I fear that the balance of our defensive investments do not adequately reflect emerging threats.

We now appear to be in the process of deciding to spend over \$1 trillion to upgrade our nuclear weapons despite the fact that our existing systems are far more sufficient to deter any rational actor. There is no adversary of ours who is not intimidated by our nuclear arsenal but who will suddenly fall in line if we add just one more upgrade or additional weapons manufacturing capability. Put simply, another generation of nuclear weapons will not make us significantly safer.

On the other hand, we live in a world where newly emerging and potentially equally great threats loom: first, bioterror, driven by recent breakthroughs in genetic engineering and off-the-shelf biotechnology; and, second, lethal autonomous weapons systems driven by recent breakthroughs in machine vision, facial recognition, and artificial intelligence. These are small, inexpensive lethal drones and similar devices that use machine vision and artificial intelligence to target individuals or groups of humans, potentially without any human involvement in the kill decision.

For those of my colleagues unfamiliar with these technologies, perform an internet search for the term "lethal autonomous weapons systems," sometimes abbreviated "LAWS"; or read the recent press coverage of the ab initio synthesis of the horsepox virus, a close variant of the smallpox virus that killed millions; then search for the term "biohacking."

For more detailed information, I urge my colleagues to request a classified or

unclassified briefing on recent studies of these subjects by the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine.

Both of these technologies pose unique threats to our national security for two reasons:

The first is because of the small physical footprint of a terror facility based on either of these technologies. Either a bioterror laboratory or a small shop to produce and program small lethal drones could easily fit in a basement or small apartment. There is no radiological signature to detect them as there is with nuclear material.

The second is because of the low cost and general availability of key enabling technological components. The monetary investment necessary for a capable terror facility is in the range of hundreds of thousands of dollars, perhaps less.

The relevant technologies are already in wide use in industry.

Contrast this with the threats of nuclear proliferation, where the multibillion-dollar investment to enrich and separate nuclear fissile material pretty much limits nuclear weapons either to established nation-states or perhaps terrorist organizations with access to fissile material from poorly guarded facilities.

Anyone who is unconvinced that we need to take these emerging threats seriously needs only to look at what happened in cybersecurity. One of the painful lessons we have learned in recent years is that everything evil that can be done with computer viruses has, in fact, been done. In large part, this is because of the low barriers to entry and the difficulty of attributing an attack. Both of these features are shared fully by both bioterror and lethal autonomous weapons systems.

So if we are going to stay ahead of these threats, we need to be strategic about our investments. It is time to reconsider the wisdom of pouring hundreds of billions of dollars into Cold War weapons which contribute negligibly to our national security and past time to consider a much more rapid increase in investments in defensive measures against lethal autonomous weapons systems and against bioterror, because by the time they become a reality, it will be too late to react.

As a leader in technology and innovation, the United States should act now to circumvent any danger these technologies could pose.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman's concern on this issue and appreciate the fact that

he brought it up for discussion here tonight.

I would note that the weapons activities accounts provides funding to ensure the reliability of our Nation's nuclear weapons stockpile. The NNSA does not use funds within this account to counter proliferation of biological weapons, although I understand it is an important issue, and I agree with them we need to address this issue.

However, this amendment increases and decreases the same account and has no effect on the bill overall, so I will accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and to take the time to educate themselves about these emerging threats.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 52 OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 52 printed in House Report 115-259.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 297, line 21, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$118,017,000)".

Page 298, line 11, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$118,017,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 473, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to be on a roll here, given the last amendment being accepted on a "yes" vote.

This amendment would make America more secure by focusing our very limited tax dollars on programs to keep nuclear material out of the hands of terrorists rather than excess national laboratory infrastructure spending.

According to The Washington Post, the world dodged a bullet when ISIS failed to realize that it had the ingredients for a dirty bomb under its control in Mosul for more than 3 years. This underscores the importance of the need for U.S. leadership and resources to secure nuclear material around the world.

My amendment would provide an increase of \$118 million for the Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation, DNN, funding. DNN funding includes critical programs such as the nuclear smuggling and detection program, which works

with partner countries to improve intelligence, law enforcement, and border security capabilities to detect nuclear material trafficking.

It also supports programs to improve the security of radiological material around the world and to remove it from areas when nuclear materials cannot be adequately and safely secured.

The Make America Secure Appropriations Act makes significant cuts to these programs which keep nuclear material out of the hands of terrorists and those who would then use that material to do us harm. For example, there is a 30 percent cut from the nuclear smuggling detection funding, a 79 percent cut from the highly enriched uranium reduction programs, and, overall, a \$150 million cut to this program.

At the same time, the underlying legislation would increase by 38 percent, a plus-up above what the administration recommended for the weapons activities infrastructure recapitalization budget line. This increase was not requested by the administration and is not supported by the Senate. The underlying bill already includes a \$59 million increase in infrastructure recapitalization spending and a \$71 million increase over the fiscal year 2017-enacted level for maintenance and repair facilities.

We can go on and on. We have heard discussions here already about the trillion-dollar-plus expansion of the nuclear weapons programs.

Specifically, this money that I would move out of this particular infrastructure recapitalization account is for the construction of a new facility to build nuclear plutonium pits. These pits are presumably going to be needed for a weapon that is almost certainly not going to be built, which is the inter-operable new bomb.

The interoperable weapon is to go on existing and remodeled rockets for the Navy and for the Air Force, neither of whom thinks it is a particularly good idea. So that program, should it ever come to pass, could be delayed, and we could then use this \$118 million now to deal with a known problem.

If, in the future, we decide that we need to be able to produce somewhere between 30 and 80 new pits a year, there is time enough to do that. The account that calls for the maintenance of the existing facilities will provide sufficient funds to meet all of the known needs, with the exception of the interoperable nuclear weapon, which, in all probability, is not ever going to be built or needed.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, although I am opposed to the amendment, I have to admit that I do enjoy our annual discussion on this.

I oppose this amendment because the bill already shows strong support for

the nonproliferation programs of the NNSA. Funding for nuclear defense nonproliferation is \$1.83 billion—\$76.5 million below fiscal year 2017 and \$16.8 million below the budget request.

Within nonproliferation, the bill largely supports funding as requested, but makes a limited number of realignments within the account to emphasize the importance of nonproliferation research and development activities and to meet international commitments for plutonium disposition.

Our understanding—and this is the important point. Our understanding is that budget request is down because NNSA still has significant unexpended balances in this account due to slow progress on international nonproliferation agreements.

Specifically, the NNSA reported in May that it had approximately \$2.2 billion in funds available to carry out its nonproliferation mission, of which over \$680 million is left over from prior years. For years, NNSA has struggled to execute funding in its nonproliferation budget because it could not obtain agreement from other nations to do the work as quickly as planned or as we would maybe like to.

This amendment also targets funding from the weapons activities infrastructure recapitalization program. Created in fiscal year 2014 by Congress, the recapitalization program has been highly successful in addressing the aging and deteriorating infrastructure at NNSA sites. Replacing things like telephone poles, leaking fireman valves, roofing, and addressing other basic infrastructure needs are essential to the safe and continued operation of these nuclear security sites.

The budget request proposed to cut the program, and the bill increases funding \$118 million above the request to restore that program to the fiscal year 2017 level. We should not divert funding needed to address these urgent infrastructure needs, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. GARAMENDI. That might be sufficient, Mr. Chairman, although I doubt I will persuade the worthy chairman with whom we have had this little tussle back and forth.

The fact of the matter is that there are two accounts to deal with this issue of the nuclear sites and the maintenance of them.

□ 2145

One is a maintenance facility, which is plussed-up and sufficient to maintain and upgrade the existing facilities, particularly the plutonium pit, the metallurgical facility, as well as continue the construction of the highly enriched uranium facilities.

Those are already available and that money is in those accounts. It turns out that this money for recapitalization is for the construction of a new pit production facility. The NNSA claims that it needs that facility to build additional pits beyond the 20 to 30 that could be constructed in the refurbished existing pit.

The need for the new pit production facility is specifically for the inter-operable nuclear warhead, which is not likely to be needed. And should it be decided at a future date to be needed, there is plenty of time to build the facility and construct the additional nuclear plutonium pits. The bottom line is that this money is not needed now for that facility.

Could the money be used in the non-proliferation?

It could.

Why were those agreements delayed?

Because of many different reasons, but the fact of the matter is that those agreements are going to be going forward. The fact of the matter is that there is a continuing problem of loose nukes and materials around the world, which can cause a problem. The Mosul situation is one of many examples.

The cuts that do take place in smuggling, in research, and the like are serious. We ought to be paying attention.

Mr. Chairman, I look forward to the continuation of this discussion, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I would just say that this infrastructure need is not for a new pit facility. They would need to come to us and ask us what they were going to do with funding, and request funding for that. They did not do that. This is for infrastructure needs and upgrades.

But the other thing is that I am as much a nonproliferation activist as anyone in this body. I think it is important work. But the reality is that there are \$681 million unexpended from previous years, not because funding is not available—the money is there—but they haven't been able to get agreements with other countries. Unfortunately, you can't do work in other countries without having agreements with those countries.

So, consequently, we are—I guess you could maybe say—overfunded in non-proliferation if we can't spend the money on that activity. That is the problem.

Why would we put the money into that when we need the money in infrastructure and building and repairing the buildings and facilities that NNSA has?

It just doesn't make any sense to me.

I am sure if this amendment is defeated, we will have this discussion next year, and I hope my colleagues will vote against this.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 53 OFFERED BY MS. ROSEN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 53 printed in House Report 115-259.

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 301, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$30,000,000)”.

Page 326, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$30,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 473, the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Nevada.

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment to strip funding for defense nuclear waste disposal and return this money to the Treasury in order to reduce the deficit.

The \$30 million allocated under the appropriations bill being considered here tonight has the potential to be used to expand Yucca Mountain so that it can be used to store defense waste, in addition to civilian nuclear waste.

If there is one issue a majority of Nevadans agree on, it is that we wholeheartedly oppose becoming the Nation's dumping ground for radioactive waste.

First, for my non-Nevada friends, some history. In 1987, Congress amended the Nuclear Waste Policy Act and targeted Yucca Mountain, located less than 100 miles northwest of Las Vegas, as the sole site for our Nation's geological repository. It is a fancy way of choosing Nevada as their nuclear dump.

For over 30 years, the State of Nevada and local communities have rejected this misguided project on safety, public health, and environmental grounds. In fact, we have filed 218 contentions against the Department of Energy's license application, citing safety and environmental issues in its assessments.

Numerous scientific studies have deemed Yucca Mountain unsafe based on the fact that it sits above an aquifer and is in a seismically active area that just experienced a 4.1 magnitude earthquake.

Any plans involving Yucca Mountain, including the recently introduced Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Acts, or any proposed plans to commingle defense and civilian nuclear waste at Yucca, ignore the environmental, safety, and security concerns of Nevadans

who would be forced to store nuclear waste that they had no role in creating.

Using Yucca Mountain as the Nation's dumping ground would require transporting over 70,000 metric tons of radioactive waste, much of it through my district and through the heart of Las Vegas, a city that attracts over 43 million visitors annually and generates over \$59 billion in revenue.

Not only does this project endanger those in Nevada, Mr. Chairman, it also threatens the health and safety of millions of Americans from over 329 congressional districts across this country who live along the proposed transportation route.

As if this wasn't bad enough, now the Nation's most egregious nuclear waste producers and even some of my colleagues across the aisle are suggesting that we commingle defense waste with civilian waste from power plants, inappropriately increasing the amount of high-level radioactive material dumped in Nevada by 37 percent. This means more nuclear material coming to Yucca, and more waste traveling through 44 States and Washington, D.C.

There are also concerns that this will hinder the Air Force's readiness and our country's ability to defend itself. Last week, the Las Vegas Review-Journal ran a story featuring Heather Wilson, Secretary of the Air Force, and her concerns with the Yucca Mountain project.

She cited how it will directly impact Nellis Air Force Base's ability to complete its mission to train servicemembers for war, because there is no route across the range that would not impact testing and training.

Her concerns, unfortunately, are not new. Since 2003, the Air Force has consistently stated that they know of no route through the Nevada Test and Training Range that would avoid sensitive areas or not negatively impact readiness activities.

I understand that our country's nuclear waste must go somewhere, but this decades-old battle has proven that Yucca is not the place. We must stop wasting billions of taxpayer dollars by resurrecting a project that has been dead for over 30 years, and, instead, identify viable alternatives for the long-term repository in areas that are proven safe and whose communities consent to storage.

Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to withdraw my amendment, with the understanding that we will begin a serious discussion on how to properly handle our country's waste, instead of continuing down the path of forcing this waste on my State.

I fully understand we have to put our country's defense and civilian waste somewhere. But for the first time, let's bring Nevadans to the table and let's share the responsibility of facing the consequences of nuclear production.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time and withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 54 OFFERED BY MS. PINGREE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 54 printed in House Report 115-259.

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 325, strike lines 17 through 21.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 473, the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Maine.

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Pingree-Carbajal-Bonamici-Langevin-Lowenthal-Cicilline-Schneider-Beyer amendment, which is widely supported.

All of the cosponsors of this amendment care passionately about the need for ocean planning, and I commend the leadership of my colleagues on this issue each and every year that we fight this battle for sensible ocean policy.

We need, as a Congress, to recognize the importance of our oceans and ocean planning. Ocean planning works, and is working already in New England, where we have a success story of fishermen, lobstermen, Native American Tribes, local communities, and other stakeholders developing voluntary regional ocean plans.

I have heard from many of my constituents working in Maine's island communities about the importance not only of ocean planning, but of eco-based management of our oceans, a core part of moving forward to a 21st century fishery.

Our fishery is changing, and coastal communities want to be attentive to changes in our ecosystems to resource development and other uses for our oceans. For example, our plan in New England ensures that there is advanced ecological data available to help decisionmakers, enhance ocean stakeholder engagement through the collection of stakeholder-driven information, and facilitates agency coordination.

The language in today's underlying bill would make it even more difficult for Federal agencies, State, and local communities to work together on the future of our ocean resources.

For those of us representing coastal districts, this rider is a bad addition to the bill, and we need to strike it.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER).

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong support and as a proud cosponsor of this amendment. I do so in defense of one of our most magnificent natural resources: the Great Lakes.

The Great Lakes contain a fifth of the world's and 95 percent of our Nation's surface water. The Lakes are an important asset to our economy and the quality of life of our Nation, and in my district in particular.

The National Ocean Policy also helps protect the vitality of our Great Lakes ecosystem. However, section 505 of this bill will undermine our National Ocean Policy and the ability of agencies to coordinate with States, local governments, and other agencies to protect these beautiful waters. That is why I support striking section 505.

We have a profound obligation to be responsible stewards of the environment and to pass on a clean, healthy, and dynamic environment for future generations.

Mr. Chair, I support the Pingree amendment.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

While there may be instances—and I am sure there are—in which greater coordination would be helpful in ensuring our coastal resources are available for future generations, any such coordination must be done carefully to protect against Federal overreach.

As we saw with the Obama administration's WOTUS rule to redefine waters of the United States, thorough and strong Congressional oversight is needed to ensure that we protect private property rights.

Unfortunately, the way the Obama administration developed the National Ocean Policy increased the opportunities for Federal overreach. The implementation plan is so broad and so sweeping that it may allow the Federal Government to affect agricultural practices, mining, energy producers, fishermen, and anyone else whose actions may have an impact on the oceans.

The facts is that the previous administration did not work with Congress. This is their National Ocean Policy. They never brought it to Congress.

If you are going to do something this sweeping, you need to have congressional input. They never came to Congress to develop its plan, and they had even refused to provide relevant information to Congress. So we can't be sure how sweeping it actually could be if left unchecked.

□ 2200

That is why I support the language of the underlying bill and, therefore, oppose this amendment. But I understand their concern. But why not bring it to Congress? Why not have Congress enact the National Ocean Policy instead of just relying on the executive branch to do whatever they want to do? That is the problem the Natural Resources Committee has with this. It is a problem I have with this, and that is why I oppose this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, if my good colleague could guarantee me he could give me the votes on the floor, I would be happy to bring a bill like that forward to Congress.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to my colleague from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL).

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, my district is a poster child for the need for ocean coordination and information sharing. In my district, we have the busiest port complex in North America, we have offshore drilling, we have San Clemente Island, which is a naval training ground where they have a ship-to-shore firing range. We have abundant wildlife in the district. On top of that, sea level rise and extreme weather threatens neighborhoods and businesses all along the coast of my district.

With so much activity happening, it simply makes sense to have the various stakeholders at the table, to make sure ships come in and out of port safely, to ensure that our thriving economy stays thriving, and to give the military space to train. We want these collaborations to happen because we want to have a sustainable ocean economy.

By developing regional plans and having a framework for multi-stakeholder involvement, we can promote a robust ocean economy that also conserves our precious ocean resources. The country and my district needs a comprehensive approach to our ocean resources, which the National Ocean Policy provides.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this amendment.

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Maine has 1½ minutes remaining.

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I will just say it is kind of interesting that I don't disagree with anything Ms. PINGREE is saying. The problem is, there is a process, and Congress needs to be involved.

The last administration did not involve Congress. If it is a good policy, why don't we just let the administration do it? If you can't get the votes on the floor, doesn't that tell you something?

Maybe you need to go and work this out and bring the policy to the floor. But if we are just going to let the administration do that, I don't know, maybe we will let this administration just enact a tax policy because we have a tough time doing it here in Congress. I don't know, maybe we will let them enact the healthcare policy because we can't get together on the floor to see what to do about our healthcare system, so let's just let the administration do it all.

It is exactly what you are doing with this. You bring an actual ocean policy to the floor, if I think it is a good bill

and necessary, I will vote for it. I can't tell you what I will vote for yet because I haven't seen it.

But just because Congress hasn't acted doesn't give the administrative branch of government the right to interject itself and take on the legislative branch of government's responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, with all due respect, I think there are frequently moments when the administration overrides the opinion of the Congress or don't always agree and the administration gets their way. Take the decision the administration made this morning on military policy, which was contrary to the vote we took just this week on the appropriations process.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CARBAJAL).

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Chair, I want to thank all of my colleagues for their leadership and work on this important amendment to strike this harmful rider, to prevent implementation of the National Ocean Policy.

The National Ocean Policy ensures we are able to implement marine planning efforts based on management components of the National Ocean Policy. It also allows coordination between Federal agencies to make sure they are working in a collaborative manner to improve our ocean's health.

This brings all stakeholders together, including conservationists, fishermen, scientists, shipping companies, and those who live and work in our ocean communities, and it will allow them to have a voice in finding solutions for effective management of our oceans.

Healthy sustainable ecosystems and economic growth are not mutually exclusive. That is why we need to make sure we strike this harmful rider.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman from Maine has expired.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chair, I will just say, the usurpation by the administrative branch of government over Congress happens with both Republican and Democratic administrations. I remember someone standing up and saying: Well, if Congress won't do it, I have a pen and a phone.

This is Congress surrendering our responsibility, and even though you might like the outcome of what they do, it is the wrong thing to do, and Congress needs to stand up at times and take back our responsibility than just saying: Well, I don't really like the way it was done, but I like the policy, so I will just support it. And that is what we are doing here. That is the problem with the National Ocean Policy.

Again, I would encourage the supporters of this, and who knows, I might be one of them, to bring it to Congress. Let's debate it. Let's have a good healthy debate on this floor. Go

through the committee process, go through the regular order, and then it is something that we might be able to support in the appropriations process.

Other than that, I would urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chair, as the designee of Ranking Member LOWEY, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the gentlewoman's amendment to support the growth of vibrant coastal economies and creation of fisheries and agriculture jobs.

The National Ocean Policy is helping agencies and States collaborate to reduce illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing, and one can just take a look that the ocean policy supports almost 2 million fisheries-related jobs in our country and \$5.3 billion in commercial fish landings, as well as enhanced tourism, and the National Ocean Policy doesn't cost us anything.

I just want to remind people that our country currently imports 91 percent of consumed seafood, with half coming from foreign agriculture. So this policy is extraordinarily important.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) for the purpose of entering into a colloquy.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and I rise today to speak in strong support of the amendment offered by my colleague, Congresswoman PINGREE, which would strike the harmful provision that undermines the importance of the National Ocean Policy.

For over 7 years, the National Ocean Policy has helped guide ocean management through spurring coordination among government agencies. Ocean planning and coordination is an important aspect in supporting economic growth, protecting coastal habitats, and strengthening coastal communities.

The National Ocean Policy does not create any regulations, supersede current regulations, or modify any agency's established mission, jurisdiction, or authority. Rather, it helps coordinate the implementation of existing regulations by Federal agencies to establish a more efficient and effective decisionmaking process.

Throughout the northeast, the Regional Ocean Council allows our States to pool resources and businesses to have a strong voice in decisions that will impact their communities and facilitate coordination with Federal partners.

I am proud to say that the Northeast Regional Ocean Council is the first in the Nation to release a draft regional ocean plan. My home State of Rhode Island, the ocean State, has benefited greatly from the National Ocean Policy. With help from NOP, the Block Is-

land Wind Farm project was successfully completed and today is capable of powering an estimated 17,000 homes.

At a time when our oceans are facing significant challenges and changes, maintaining coordination and planning is necessary in continuing to strengthen our country's coastal communities and ocean industries. Allowing Federal agencies to coordinate implementation of over 100 ocean laws and giving State and local governments a voice in the ocean planning process is smart policy, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and strike this ill-advised provision.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chair, may I ask how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio has 2 minutes remaining.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the establishment of a National Ocean Policy was a landmark step for our country. I particularly want to commend Senator SHELDON WHITEHOUSE from Rhode Island for his leadership on this issue.

Ocean planning just makes sense, as we have seen in Rhode Island during implementation of our Special Area Management Plan. Instead of haphazard policymaking or turning the ocean into a political football, we brought all stakeholders to the table, commercial and recreational fishermen, energy development companies, conservationists, and other local interests.

The National Ocean Policy builds on this type of collaboration. It is a bottom-up approach, and it empowers local communities who use our oceans.

I want to echo the words also of my colleague, the Congressman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), in support of this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to allow this forward-thinking approach to continue. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman so much for coming to the floor tonight, and I want to thank all of our colleagues who have spoken out so eloquently on the importance of National Ocean Policy in supporting the Pingree, et al. amendment.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Maine will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 55 OFFERED BY MR. KIHUEN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 55 printed in House Report 115-259.

Mr. KIHUEN. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 326, strike lines 1 through 7.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 473, the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. KIHUEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nevada.

Mr. KIHUEN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment strikes language in the bill that would prohibit the closure of the Yucca Mountain project, which includes the storage of high-level nuclear waste in my district.

As you may know, in 1987, Nevada was targeted as our Nation's nuclear waste dump through the "Screw Nevada" bill. In the 30 years since the bill passed, Congress has wasted \$3.7 billion of taxpayer money.

Yucca Mountain sits in a seismically active area less than 100 miles away from Las Vegas, which holds an urban area with over 2 million residents. Mr. Chairman, just last week, there was an earthquake 33 miles away from Yucca Mountain. This place is not safe for our nuclear waste.

Moreover, the city sees tens of thousands of visitors traveling to Las Vegas each and every year, many of whom are your constituents from your districts. In 2016 alone, over 40 million visitors traveled to Las Vegas.

I have grave concerns with the transportation of nuclear waste to Yucca Mountain should this project continue against the will of my constituents. This project will not just impact my constituents. It impacts constituents in 329 congressional districts in 44 different States and Washington, D.C. Putting a nuclear repository in our backyard means that this high-level nuclear waste must travel through your backyards first.

Your constituents will see high-level nuclear waste transported through their communities on rail and truck. A simple car crash or train derailment would leave your constituents at risk and cost our taxpayers more money to clean up the mess.

As it stands, Mr. Chairman, this transportation plan also damages our national security and the ability of the Nevada Test and Training Range, the largest air and ground range in the contiguous United States, to meet and train our servicemembers.

□ 2215

Mr. Chairman, I have been to Yucca Mountain. I have driven through the desert that is home to the bighorn sheep and desert tortoises and ancient petroglyphs and relics of the westward expansion. It is clear that reopening Yucca Mountain threatens the health and safety of Nevadans and Americans from across the country.

Our State, which has no nuclear energy-producing facilities, should not be

the dumping ground for the rest of the country's nuclear waste. And the bottom line is this: If any of my colleagues would support this bill to bring Yucca Mountain nuclear waste to our State, then I am sure you support bringing it to your State. I am sure we can find a location in your State, and I would love to work with you on that. I am sure you wouldn't like your neighbors bringing their trash to your backyard. Don't bring it to my backyard either. Don't bring it to my constituents. Don't bring it to Nevada.

I urge your support for my amendment. Prevent billions and billions of dollars, taxpayer dollars, being wasted by continuing to pursue the Yucca Mountain project.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. WALKER). The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I would tell the gentleman that they have brought a lot of nuclear waste to the State of Idaho. We process it there. It was Rocky Flats that was, they say, cleaned up. It wasn't cleaned up; it was moved to Idaho because we got most of their stuff there. That is kind of what happens.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose this amendment. I think we all understand why my colleagues from Nevada oppose Yucca Mountain, their position on Yucca Mountain; however, I cannot support this amendment. It is time to move forward with the Yucca licensing process.

The previous administration ignored the law. I repeat that—ignored the law. Ignoring our obligation to take responsibility for this spent fuel, and breaking trust with 32 States stopped this process in its tracks.

I don't think I have to state why that happened. It wasn't because of science or anything else. We all know why they stopped the licensing process at Yucca Mountain.

The decision has already cost taxpayers \$6 billion in claims, and the Department of Energy estimates at least another \$24 billion in claims.

This administration has taken swift action to put us back on track, and the budget request proposed in this bill includes \$150 million for Yucca licensing efforts. Licensing efforts will continue to involve experts in geochemistry, hydrology, geology, seismology, volcanology, and more to ensure that Yucca Mountain, already one of the most studied pieces of land on Earth—I would say the most studied piece of land on Earth. There were 52 or 53 National Academy of Sciences studies on Yucca Mountain that have been done. But it will get a careful review from all aspects of its license applications.

Once that application is finished, all Members of this body and of the Senate will have the opportunity to decide

whether we move forward to construct and use the facility. But killing the process at this point is shortsighted, and, therefore, I oppose the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KIHUEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN), my esteemed colleague.

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to echo the sentiments of my colleague from Nevada (Mr. KIHUEN) by making one thing perfectly clear: Nevadans are completely against becoming the Nation's nuclear dumping ground. And make no mistake, that is exactly what this appropriations bill does.

Without Mr. KIHUEN's amendment, of which I am proud to be a cosponsor, Congress will tie the hands of this administration by explicitly prohibiting, even considering, closing Yucca Mountain or conducting a technical review before licensing activities begin.

You heard that right. The underlying bill forbids any funds from being used to conduct activities that preclude Yucca Mountain from becoming the Nation's dumping ground for radioactive waste, no matter the science, no matter the evidence.

And we already have the evidence that bringing America's nuclear waste to Yucca is bad for Nevadans and bad for Americans. We know that Yucca is unsafe for nuclear waste because it is seismically active and sits above an aquifer. And with 70,000 metric tons of radioactive waste through my district and through the heart of Las Vegas, those visitors from all across the country and the world will be exposed.

Mr. KIHUEN. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I would just say in response: Then change the law. The law is that Yucca Mountain is the waste repository for high-level nuclear waste. All we are asking is to continue the licensing process.

As I said during my opening statement, Congress will have a chance to vote on whether to proceed with the construction of this facility. That is the reality. But we have got to get off the dime and start moving and handling this nuclear waste or it is going to cost us billions and billions and billions more.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. KIHUEN).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 56 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON
LEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 56 printed in House Report 115-259.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division D, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. _____. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for "Corps of Engineers-Civil-Investigations", and increasing the amount made available for the same account, by \$3,000,000.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 473, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I am going to take this opportunity just to show this picture to my colleagues on the floor of the House and the headline that says: "Urban Flooding in Houston is on the Rise."

I clearly just used the city of Houston by coincidence, but I will tell you that this is what we are facing, really, across America.

The opening sentence of the article says: "Before you can fix a problem, you need to know what's causing it."

My amendment is just that. My amendment—as I thank Chairman SIMPSON and Ranking Member KAPTUR for their work on this legislation in doing the best that we can under the circumstances of trying to preserve the balance—speaks to the need for robust funding for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' investigations account by redirecting \$3 million for increased funding for postdisaster watershed assessment studies, like the one that has been contemplated in many areas around the country.

As the Federal agency that collects and studies basic information pertaining to river and harbor, flood and storm damage reduction, shore protection, aquatic ecosystem restoration, and conducts detailed studies, plans, and specifications for river and harbor and flood and storm damage reduction, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers plays a critical role in building, maintaining, and expanding the most critical of the Nation's infrastructure.

When questioning the Army Corps of Engineers about a certain area in my community covering a number of bayous, which we are called The Bayou City—Sims Bayou, Greens Bayou, Brays Bayou, White Oak Bayou, Hunting Bayou, and Clear Creek Bayou—it is the same all over the Nation: the Army Corps of Engineers said they need to study the issue to know how to best resolve it.

My amendment is just that. It is resources to be directed to ensure that we are allowed to study issues so that we can focus the dollars correctly as we attempt to work collaboratively with our local communities.

I ask my colleagues to support this amendment, and I make this point: such a study is certainly needed, given the frequency and severity of historic-level flood events in many parts around

our Nation and in the area in which I live.

On April 15, 2016, an estimated 240 billion gallons of water fell in the Houston area over a 12-hour period.

Let me be very mindful, this is not an earmark. It simply says that we should have the resources to study these issues so that we can direct monies in the right way.

Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Texas has 2½ minutes remaining.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me conclude my remarks by indicating that I believe this particular amendment will be helpful in general to, in essence, provide funding for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' investigations account and ensuring that a postdisaster watershed assessment can result.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Ms. KAPTUR in particular. We have spoken about this for probably over a 2-year period. I think the very fact that my particular area can be cited as an example of what happens when you have urban flooding is just an example.

Over this past summer, we know that we have had some serious loss of life when rivers have overflowed or areas where water is and people have been recreating have overflowed, and so the idea of saving lives is part of my amendment as well.

Mr. Chair, I want to thank Chairman SIMPSON and Ranking Member KAPTUR for shepherding this legislation to the floor and for their commitment to preserving America's great natural environment and resources so that they can serve and be enjoyed by generations to come.

My amendment speaks to the need for robust funding for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers "Investigations" account by redirecting \$3 million for increased funding for post-disaster watershed assessment studies, like the one that is being contemplated for the Houston/Harris County metropolitan area.

As the federal agency that collects and studies basic information pertaining to river and harbor, flood and storm damage reduction, shore protection, aquatic ecosystem restoration, and conducts detailed studies, plans, and specifications for river and harbor, and flood and storm damage reduction, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers plays a critical role in the building, maintaining, and expanding of the most critical of the nation's infrastructure.

We understand this very well in my home state of Texas and the Eighteenth Congressional District that I represent.

The Army Corps of Engineers has been working with the Harris County Flood Control District since 1937 to reduce the risk of flooding within Harris County.

Current projects include 6 federal flood risk management projects: Sims Bayou, Greens Bayou, Brays Bayou, White Oak Bayou, Hunting Bayou, and Clear Creek.

In addition to these ongoing projects, the Army Corps of Engineers operates and maintains the Addicks and Barker (A&B) Detention Dams in northwest Harris County.

Mr. Chair, I am pleased that the bill provides that the Secretary of the Army may initiate up

to six new study starts during fiscal year 2018, and that five of those studies are to consist of studies where the majority of the benefits are derived from flood and storm damage reduction or from navigation transportation savings.

I am optimistic that one of those new study starts will be the Houston Regional Watershed Assessment Flood Risk Management Feasibility study.

Such a study is certainly needed given the frequency and severity of historic-level flood events in recent years in and around the Houston metropolitan area.

On April 15, 2016, an estimated 240 billion gallons of water fell in the Houston area over a 12 hour period, which resulted in several areas exceeding the 100 to 500 year flood event record.

The areas that experience these historic rainfalls were west of I-45, north of I-10, and Greens Bayou.

Additionally, an estimated 140 billion gallons of water fell over the Cypress Creek, Spring Creek, and Addicks watershed in just 14 hours.

The purpose of the Houston Regional Watershed Assessment is to identify risk reduction measures and optimize performance from a multi-objective systems performance perspective of the regional network of nested and intermingled watersheds, reservoir dams, flood flow conveyance channels, storm water detention basins, and related Flood Risk Management (FRM) infrastructure.

Special emphases of the study, which covers 22 primary watersheds within Harris County's 1,756 square miles, will be placed on extreme flood events that exceed the system capacity resulting in impacts to asset conditions/functions and loss of life.

Mr. Chair, during the May 2015 Houston flood, 3,015 homes were flooded and 8 persons died; during the April 2016 Houston flood, 5,400 homes were flooded and 8 deaths recorded.

The economic damage caused by the 2015 Houston flood is estimated at \$3 billion; the 2016 estimate is being compiled and is estimated to be well above \$2 billion.

Mr. Chair, minimizing the risk of flood damage to the Houston and Harris County metropolitan area, the nation's 4th largest, is a matter of national significance because the region is one of the nation's major technology, energy, finance, export and medical centers:

1. Port of Houston is the largest bulk port in the world;

2. Texas Medical Center is a world renowned teaching, research and treatment center;

3. Houston is home to the largest conglomeration of foreign bank representation and second only to New York City as home to the most Fortune 500 companies; and

4. The Houston Watershed Assessment study area sits within major Hurricane Evacuation arteries for the larger Galveston Gulf Coast region.

I ask my colleagues to join me and support Jackson Lee Amendment No. 56.

I thank Chairman SIMPSON and Ranking Member KAPTUR for their work in shepherding this bill to the floor.

[From the Houston Public Media]

URBAN FLOODING IN HOUSTON IS ON THE RISE

(By Marissa Cummings)

Before you can fix a problem, you need to know what's causing it.

Dr. Sam Brody, Professor at A&M Galveston, is doing exactly that.

He focuses on urban flooding and says Houston is the poster child.

"The bigger driver of this urban flood problem is human development, it's the spread of impervious surfaces and I calculated the Houston region increased its pavement by 25 percent over a 15 year period from 1996 to 2010," says Brody.

He is also contributing to national research that will help alleviate urban flooding across the U.S.

Stephen Costello, Houston's Flood Czar, agrees with Brody's assessment.

Part of the solution he says is investing in innovative infrastructure.

"But there has to be a commitment on the part of the community to invest in infrastructure," Costello says. "And that's what the voters should be looking at saying 'OK, so let's make sure we continue to invest in the infrastructure,' and that's where the public needs to get involved."

Although, we cannot stop flooding from happening, Costello says we need to mitigate and reduce the risk.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 115-259 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. PERRY of Pennsylvania.

Amendment No. 5 by Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.

Amendment No. 7 by Mr. TAKANO of California.

Amendment No. 23 by Mr. KING of Iowa.

Amendment No. 38 by Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

Amendment No. 39 by Mr. NORCROSS of New Jersey.

Amendment No. 44 by Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.

Amendment No. 52 by Mr. GARAMENDI of California.

Amendment No. 54 by Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

Amendment No. 56 by Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr.

PERRY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 107, noes 314, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 416]

AYES—107

Abraham	Gallagher	Messer
Allen	Garrett	Mooney (WV)
Babin	Gibbs	Mullin
Bacon	Gohmert	Norman
Banks (IN)	Goodlatte	Olson
Barr	Gosar	Palazzo
Barton	Gowdy	Palmer
Biggs	Graves (GA)	Pearce
Bishop (UT)	Griffith	Perry
Blackburn	Grothman	Pittenger
Brat	Harris	Poe (TX)
Bridenstine	Hensarling	Posey
Brooks (AL)	Hice, Jody B.	Ratcliffe
Buck	Hudson	Renacci
Budd	Huizenga	Rohrabacher
Burgess	Hunter	Rokita
Byrne	Jenkins (WV)	Rooney, Francis
Carter (GA)	Johnson, Sam	Rothfus
Chabot	Jordan	Rouzer
Cheney	Kelly (MS)	Scott, Austin
Comer	King (IA)	Sensenbrenner
Cramer	Labrador	Smith (MO)
Culberson	LaHood	Stewart
Davidson	LaMalfa	Wagner
DeSantis	Lamborn	Walberg
DesJarlais	Latta	Weber (TX)
Duffy	Love	Webster (FL)
Duncan (SC)	Lucas	Wenstrup
Duncan (TN)	Luetkemeyer	Westerman
Dunn	Marchant	Williams
Estes (KS)	Marino	Wilson (SC)
Farenthold	Marshall	Wittman
Ferguson	Massie	Yoho
Flores	McCauley	Young (AK)
Franks (AZ)	McKinley	Zeldin
Gaetz	Meadows	

NOES—314

Adams	Chu, Judy	Dingell
Aguilar	Cicilline	Doggett
Amash	Clark (MA)	Donovan
Amodei	Clarke (NY)	Doyle, Michael
Arrington	Clay	F.
Barletta	Cleaver	Ellison
Barragán	Clyburn	Emmer
Bass	Coffman	Engel
Beatty	Cohen	Eshoo
Bera	Cole	Espallat
Bergman	Collins (GA)	Esty (CT)
Beyer	Collins (NY)	Evans
Bilirakis	Comstock	Faso
Bishop (GA)	Conaway	Fitzpatrick
Bishop (MI)	Connolly	Fleischmann
Black	Conyers	Fortenberry
Blumenauer	Cook	Foster
Blunt Rochester	Cooper	Fox
Bonamici	Correa	Frankel (FL)
Bost	Costa	Frelinghuysen
Boyle, Brendan	Courtney	Fudge
F.	Crawford	Gabbard
Brady (PA)	Crist	Gallego
Brady (TX)	Crowley	Garamendi
Brooks (IN)	Cuellar	Gianforte
Brown (MD)	Curbelo (FL)	Gomez
Brownley (CA)	Davis (CA)	Gonzalez (TX)
Buchanan	Davis, Danny	Gottheimer
Bucshon	Davis, Rodney	Granger
Bustos	DeFazio	Graves (LA)
Butterfield	DeGette	Graves (MO)
Calvert	Delaney	Green, Al
Capuano	DeLauro	Green, Gene
Carbajal	DelBene	Grijalva
Cárdenas	Demings	Guthrie
Carson (IN)	Denham	Gutiérrez
Carter (TX)	Dent	Hanabusa
Cartwright	DeSaulnier	Handel
Castor (FL)	Deutch	Harper
Castro (TX)	Diaz-Balart	Hartzler

Hastings	McCarthy	Schakowsky
Heck	McClintock	Schiff
Herrera Beutler	McCollum	Schneider
Higgins (LA)	McEachin	Schrader
Higgins (NY)	McGovern	Schweikert
Hill	McHenry	Scott (VA)
Himes	McMorris	Scott, David
Holding	Rodgers	Serrano
Hoyer	McNerney	Sessions
Huffman	McSally	Sewell (AL)
Hultgren	Meehan	Shea-Porter
Hurd	Meeks	Sherman
Issa	Meng	Shimkus
Jackson Lee	Mitchell	Shuster
Jayapal	Moolenaar	Simpson
Jenkins (KS)	Moore	Sinema
Johnson (GA)	Moulton	Sires
Johnson (LA)	Murphy (FL)	Slaughter
Johnson (OH)	Nadler	Smith (NE)
Johnson, E. B.	Neal	Smith (NJ)
Jones	Newhouse	Smith (TX)
Joyce (OH)	Noem	Smith (WA)
Kaptur	Nolan	Smucker
Katko	Norcross	Soto
Keating	Nunes	Speier
Kelly (IL)	O'Halleran	Stefanik
Kelly (PA)	O'Rourke	Stivers
Kennedy	Pallone	Suozi
Khanna	Panetta	Swalwell (CA)
Kihuen	Pascarell	Takano
Kildee	Paulsen	Taylor
Kilmer	Payne	Tenney
Kind	Pelosi	Thompson (CA)
King (NY)	Perlmutter	Thompson (MS)
Kinzing	Peters	Thompson (PA)
Knight	Peterson	Thornberry
Krishnamoorthi	Pingree	Tiberi
Kuster (NH)	Pocan	Tipton
Kustoff (TN)	Poliquin	Titus
Lance	Polis	Tonko
Langevin	Price (NC)	Torres
Larsen (WA)	Quigley	Trott
Larson (CT)	Raskin	Tsongas
Lawrence	Reed	Turner
Lawson (FL)	Reichert	Upton
Lee	Rice (NY)	Valadao
Levin	Rice (SC)	Vargas
Lewis (GA)	Richmond	Veasey
Lewis (MN)	Roby	Vela
Lieu, Ted	Roe (TN)	Velázquez
Lipinski	Rogers (AL)	Visclosky
LoBiondo	Rogers (KY)	Walden
Loebach	Rooney, Thomas	Walker
Lofgren	J.	Walorski
Long	Ros-Lehtinen	Walters, Mimi
Lowenthal	Rosen	Walz
Lowey	Roskam	Wasserman
Lujan Grisham,	Ross	Schultz
M.	Roybal-Allard	Waters, Maxine
Luján, Ben Ray	Ruiz	Watson Coleman
Lynch	Ruppersberger	Welch
MacArthur	Rush	Wilson (FL)
Maloney,	Russell	Womack
Carolyn B.	Rutherford	Woodall
Maloney, Sean	Sánchez	Yarmuth
Mast	Sanford	Yoder
Matsui	Sarbanes	Young (IA)

NOT VOTING—12

Aderholt	Hollingsworth	Napolitano
Blum	Jeffries	Royce (CA)
Costello (PA)	Loudermilk	Ryan (OH)
Cummings	Murphy (PA)	Scalise

□ 2248

Mrs. BLACK, Messrs. RICE, HOLDING, TIPTON, GUTHRIE, ROSKAM, and EMMER changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. FERGUSON, BROOKS of Alabama, JENKINS of West Virginia, PERRY, MESSER, CARTER of Georgia, and GARRETT changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chair, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 416.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. GRIFFITH

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 116, noes 309, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 417]

AYES—116

Abraham	Garrett	Messer
Allen	Gibbs	Mooney (WV)
Amash	Gohmert	Mullin
Babin	Goodlatte	Murphy (PA)
Banks (IN)	Gosar	Norman
Barr	Gowdy	Olson
Barton	Graves (GA)	Palmer
Biggs	Griffith	Pearce
Bilirakis	Grothman	Perry
Bishop (UT)	Harper	Pittenger
Blackburn	Harris	Poe (TX)
Blum	Hensarling	Posey
Brat	Hice, Jody B.	Ratcliffe
Bridenstine	Higgins (LA)	Renacci
Brooks (AL)	Hudson	Rohrabacher
Buck	Huizenga	Rokita
Budd	Hunter	Rooney, Francis
Burgess	Jenkins (WV)	Rothfus
Byrne	Johnson (LA)	Rouzer
Carter (GA)	Johnson, Sam	Royce (CA)
Chabot	Jordan	Scott, Austin
Cheney	Kelly (MS)	Sensenbrenner
Collins (GA)	King (IA)	Smith (MO)
Comer	Labrador	Stewart
Cramer	LaHood	Taylor
Crawford	LaMalfa	Wagner
Davidson	Lamborn	Walberg
DeSantis	Latta	Weber (TX)
DesJarlais	Loudermilk	Webster (FL)
Duffy	Love	Wenstrup
Duncan (SC)	Lucas	Westerman
Duncan (TN)	Luetkemeyer	Williams
Dunn	Marchant	Wilson (SC)
Estes (KS)	Marshall	Wittman
Farenthold	Massie	Yoho
Flores	Mast	Young (AK)
Franks (AZ)	McCaul	Young (IA)
Gaetz	McKinley	Zeldin
Gallagher	Meadows	

NOES—309

Adams	Bucshon	Cooper
Aderholt	Bustos	Correa
Aguilar	Butterfield	Costa
Amodei	Calvert	Courtney
Arrington	Capuano	Crist
Bacon	Carbajal	Crowley
Barletta	Cárdenas	Cuellar
Barragán	Carson (IN)	Culberson
Bass	Carter (TX)	Curbelo (FL)
Beatty	Cartwright	Davis (CA)
Bera	Castor (FL)	Davis, Danny
Bergman	Castro (TX)	Davis, Rodney
Beyer	Chu, Judy	DeFazio
Bishop (GA)	Cicilline	DeGette
Bishop (MI)	Clark (MA)	Delaney
Black	Clarke (NY)	DeLauro
Blumenauer	Clay	DeBene
Blunt Rochester	Cleaver	Demings
Bonamici	Clyburn	Denham
Bost	Coffman	Dent
Boyle, Brendan	Cohen	DeSaulnier
F.	Cole	Deutch
Brady (PA)	Collins (NY)	Diaz-Balart
Brady (TX)	Comstock	Dingell
Brooks (IN)	Conaway	Doggett
Brown (MD)	Connolly	Donovan
Brownley (CA)	Conyers	Doyle, Michael
Buchanan	Cook	F.

Ellison	Lawson (FL)	Rosen
Emmer	Lee	Roskam
Engel	Levin	Ross
Eshoo	Lewis (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Españalat	Lewis (MN)	Ruiz
Esty (CT)	Lieu, Ted	Ruppersberger
Evans	Lipinski	Rush
Faso	LoBiondo	Russell
Ferguson	Loeb sack	Rutherford
Fitzpatrick	Lofgren	Sánchez
Fleischmann	Long	Sanford
Fortenberry	Lowenthal	Sarbanes
Foster	Lowe y	Schakowsky
Fox x	Lujan Grisham,	Schiff
Frankel (FL)	M.	Schneider
Frelinghuysen	Luján, Ben Ray	Schrader
Fudge	Lynch	Schweikert
Gabbard	MacArthur	Scott (VA)
Gallego	Maloney, Sean	Scott, David
Garamendi	Marino	Serrano
Gianforte	Matsui	Sessions
Gomez	McCarthy	Sewell (AL)
Gonzalez (TX)	McClintock	Shea-Porter
Gottheimer	McCollum	Sherman
Granger	McEachin	Shimkus
Graves (LA)	McGovern	Shuster
Graves (MO)	McHenry	Simpson
Green, Al	McMorris	Sinema
Green, Gene	Rodgers	Sires
Grijalva	McNerney	Slaughter
Guthrie	McSally	Smith (NE)
Gutiérrez	Meehan	Smith (NJ)
Hanabusa	Meeks	Smith (TX)
Handel	Meng	Smith (WA)
Hart zler	Mitchell	Smucker
Hastings	Moolenaar	Soto
Heck	Moore	Speier
Herrera Beutler	Moulton	Stefanik
Higgins (NY)	Murphy (FL)	Stivers
Hill	Nadler	Suo zzi
Himes	Neal	Swalwell (CA)
Holding	Newhouse	Takano
Hoyer	Noem	Tenney
Huffman	Nolan	Thompson (CA)
Hultgren	Norcross	Thompson (MS)
Hurd	Nunes	Thompson (PA)
Issa	O'Halleran	Thornberry
Jackson Lee	O'Rourke	Tiberi
Jayapal	Palazzo	Tipton
Jenkins (KS)	Pallone	Titus
Johnson (GA)	Panetta	Tonko
Johnson (OH)	Pascarell	Torres
Johnson, E. B.	Paulsen	Trott
Jones	Payne	Tsongas
Joyce (OH)	Pelosi	Turner
Kaptur	Perlmutter	Upton
Katko	Peters	Valadao
Keating	Peterson	Vargas
Kelly (IL)	Pingree	Veasey
Kelly (PA)	Pocan	Vela
Kennedy	Poliquin	Velázquez
Khanna	Polis	Visclosky
Kihuen	Price (NC)	Walden
Kildee	Quigley	Walker
Kilmer	Raskin	Walorski
Kind	Reed	Walters, Mimi
King (NY)	Reichert	Wal z
Kin zinger	Rice (NY)	Wasserman
Knight	Rice (SC)	Schultz
Krishnamoorthi	Richmond	Waters, Maxine
Kuster (NH)	Roby	Watson Coleman
Kustoff (TN)	Roe (TN)	Welch
Lance	Rogers (AL)	Wilson (FL)
Langevin	Rogers (KY)	Womack
Larsen (WA)	Rooney, Thomas	Woodall
Larson (CT)	J.	Yarmuth
Lawrence	Ros-Lehtinen	Yoder

NOT VOTING—8

Costello (PA)	Jeffries	Napolitano
Cummings	Maloney,	Ryan (OH)
Hollingsworth	Carolyn B.	Scalise

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia) (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2253

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. TAKANO

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr.

TAKANO) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. All Members are reminded we are in a 2-minute vote series. Please stay close to the floor.

This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 191, noes 236, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 418]

AYES—191

Adams	Fudge	Nolan
Aguilar	Gallego	Norman
Amash	Garamendi	O'Halleran
Barragán	Gomez	O'Rourke
Bass	Gonzalez (TX)	Pallone
Beatty	Granger	Panetta
Bera	Green, Al	Payne
Beyer	Grijalva	Pelosi
Bishop (GA)	Gutiérrez	Perlmutter
Blumenauer	Hanabusa	Peters
Blunt Rochester	Hastings	Pingree
Bonamici	Heck	Pocan
Boyle, Brendan	Higgins (NY)	Polis
F.	Himes	Price (NC)
Brown (MD)	Hoyer	Quigley
Brownley (CA)	Huffman	Raskin
Bustos	Hultgren	Rice (NY)
Butterfield	Jackson Lee	Richmond
Carbajal	Jayapal	Ros-Lehtinen
Cárdenas	Johnson (GA)	Rosen
Carson (IN)	Johnson, E. B.	Roybal-Allard
Cartwright	Kaptur	Ruiz
Castor (FL)	Keating	Ruppersberger
Castro (TX)	Kelly (IL)	Rush
Chu, Judy	Kennedy	Russell
Cicilline	Khanna	Ryan (OH)
Clark (MA)	Kihuen	Sánchez
Clarke (NY)	Kildee	Sarbanes
Clay	Kilmer	Schakowsky
Cleaver	Kind	Schiff
Clyburn	Krishnamoorthi	Schneider
Cohen	Kuster (NH)	Scott (VA)
Connolly	Lance	Scott, David
Conyers	Langevin	Serrano
Cooper	Larsen (WA)	Sewell (AL)
Correa	Larson (CT)	Shea-Porter
Costa	Lawrence	Sherman
Courtney	Lawson (FL)	Sinema
Crist	Lee	Slaughter
Crowley	Levin	Smith (TX)
Cuellar	Lewis (GA)	Smith (WA)
Curbelo (FL)	Lieu, Ted	Soto
Davis (CA)	Lipinski	Speier
Davis, Danny	Loeb sack	Suo zzi
DeFazio	Lofgren	Swalwell (CA)
DeGette	Loudermilk	Takano
Delaney	Lowenthal	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	Lowe y	Thompson (MS)
DeBene	Lujan Grisham,	Titus
Demings	M.	Tonko
DeSaulnier	Luján, Ben Ray	Torres
Deutch	Lynch	Tsongas
Dingell	Maloney, Sean	Vargas
Doggett	Marchant	Veasey
Doyle, Michael	Matsui	Vela
F.	McCaul	Velázquez
Ellison	McEachin	Visclosky
Engel	McGovern	Wal z
Eshoo	McNerney	Wasserman
Españalat	Meeks	Schultz
Esty (CT)	Meng	Waters, Maxine
Evans	Moore	Watson Coleman
Farenthold	Moulton	Welch
Foster	Murphy (FL)	Wilson (FL)
Frankel (FL)	Nadler	Yarmuth

NOES—236

Abraham	Arrington	Barletta
Aderholt	Babin	Barr
Allen	Bacon	Barton
Amodei	Banks (IN)	Bergman

Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Capuano
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffith

NOT VOTING—6

Costello (PA)
Cummings

Hollingsworth
Jeffries

Napolitano
Scalise

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2257

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 418, I mistakenly voted “yes” when I intended to vote “no.”

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 178, noes 249, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 419]

AYES—178

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Crawford
Culberson
Davidson
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz

NOES—249

Adams
Aguilar
Amodei
Barletta
Barragan
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)

Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
Denham
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donovan
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duffy
Ellison
Emmer
Engel
Eshoo
Espallat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Faso
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gianforte
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck

NOT VOTING—6

Costello (PA)
Cummings

Hollingsworth
Jeffries

Napolitano
Scalise

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2300

Messrs. GAETZ and JONES changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 38 OFFERED BY MS. CASTOR OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 181, noes 246, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 420]

AYES—181

Adams	Garamendi	O'Rourke
Aguilar	Gomez	Pallone
Amash	Gottheimer	Panetta
Barragán	Green, Al	Pascarell
Bass	Grijalva	Payne
Bera	Gutiérrez	Pelosi
Beyer	Hanabusa	Perlmutter
Bishop (GA)	Hastings	Peters
Blum	Heck	Pingree
Blumenauer	Higgins (NY)	Pocan
Blunt Rochester	Hoyer	Polis
Bonamici	Huffman	Price (NC)
Boyle, Brendan	Jackson Lee	Quigley
F.	Jayapal	Raskin
Brady (PA)	Johnson (GA)	Reichert
Brown (MD)	Johnson, E. B.	Rice (NY)
Brownley (CA)	Katko	Ros-Lehtinen
Bustos	Keating	Rosen
Butterfield	Kelly (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Capuano	Kennedy	Ruiz
Carbajal	Khanna	Ruppersberger
Cárdenas	Kihuen	Rush
Carson (IN)	Kildee	Ryan (OH)
Cartwright	Kilmer	Sanchez
Castor (FL)	Kind	Sanford
Castro (TX)	King (IA)	Sarbanes
Chu, Judy	Krishnamoorthi	Schakowsky
Ciциlline	Kuster (NH)	Schiff
Clark (MA)	Langevin	Schrader
Clarke (NY)	Lawrence	Scott (VA)
Clay	Lawson (FL)	Scott, David
Cleaver	Lee	Serrano
Clyburn	Levin	Sewell (AL)
Cohen	Lewis (GA)	Shea-Porter
Connolly	Lieu, Ted	Sherman
Conyers	Lipinski	Sires
Cooper	Loeb sack	Slaughter
Crist	Lofgren	Smith (WA)
Crowley	Lowenthal	Soto
Curbelo (FL)	Lowe y	Speier
Davis (CA)	Lujan Grisham,	Suo zzi
Davis, Danny	M.	Swalwell (CA)
DeFazio	Luján, Ben Ray	Takano
DeGette	Lynch	Thompson (CA)
Delaney	Maloney,	Titus
DelBene	Carolyn B.	Tonko
Demings	Maloney, Sean	Torres
DeSaulnier	Matsui	Tsongas
Deutch	McCollum	Vargas
Dingell	McEachin	Veasey
Doggett	McGovern	Vela
Ellison	McNerney	Velázquez
Engel	Meeks	Visclosky
Eshoo	Meng	Walz
Espallat	Moore	Wasserman
Evans	Moulton	Schultz
Fitzpatrick	Murphy (FL)	Waters, Maxine
Foster	Nadler	Watson Coleman
Frankel (FL)	Neal	Welch
Fudge	Nolan	Wilson (FL)
Gabbard	Norcross	Yarmuth
Gallego	O'Halleran	Young (IA)

NOES—246

Abraham	Amodei	Bacon
Aderholt	Arrington	Banks (IN)
Allen	Babin	Barletta

Barr	Graves (GA)	Olson
Barton	Graves (LA)	Palazzo
Beatty	Graves (MO)	Palmer
Bergman	Green, Gene	Paulsen
Biggs	Griffith	Pearce
Bilirakis	Grothman	Perry
Bishop (MI)	Guthrie	Peterson
Bishop (UT)	Handel	Pittenger
Black	Harper	Poe (TX)
Blackburn	Harris	Poliquin
Bost	Hartzler	Posey
Brady (TX)	Hensarling	Ratcliffe
Brat	Herrera Beutler	Reed
Bridenstine	Hice, Jody B.	Renacci
Brooks (AL)	Higgins (LA)	Rice (SC)
Brooks (IN)	Hill	Richmond
Buchanan	Himes	Roby
Buck	Holding	Roe (TN)
Bucshon	Hudson	Rogers (AL)
Budd	Huizenga	Rogers (KY)
Burgess	Hultgren	Rohrabacher
Byrne	Hunter	Rokita
Calvert	Hurd	Rooney, Francis
Carter (GA)	Issa	Rooney, Thomas
Carter (TX)	Jenkins (KS)	J.
Chabot	Jenkins (WV)	Roskam
Cheney	Johnson (LA)	Ross
Coffman	Johnson (OH)	Rothfus
Cole	Johnson, Sam	Rouzer
Collins (GA)	Jones	Royce (CA)
Collins (NY)	Jordan	Russell
Comer	Joyce (OH)	Rutherford
Comstock	Kaptur	Schneider
Conaway	Kelly (MS)	Schweikert
Cook	Kelly (PA)	Scott, Austin
Correa	King (NY)	Sensenbrenner
Costa	Kinzing er	Sessions
Courtney	Knight	Shimkus
Cramer	Kustoff (TN)	Shuster
Crawford	Labrador	Simpson
Cuellar	LaHood	Sinema
Culberson	LaMalfa	Smith (MO)
Davidson	Lamborn	Smith (NE)
Davis, Rodney	Lance	Smith (NJ)
DeLauro	Larsen (WA)	Smith (TX)
Denham	Larson (CT)	Smucker
Dent	Latta	Stefanik
DeSantis	Lewis (MN)	Stewart
DesJarlais	LoBiondo	Stivers
Dez-Balart	Long	Taylor
Donovan	Loudermilk	Tenney
Doyle, Michael	Love	Thompson (MS)
F.	Lucas	Thompson (PA)
Duffy	Luetkemeyer	Thornberry
Duncan (SC)	MacArthur	Tiberi
Duncan (TN)	Marchant	Tipton
Dunn	Marino	Trott
Emmer	Marshall	Turner
Estes (KS)	Massie	Upton
Esty (CT)	Mast	Valadao
Farenthold	McCarthy	Veasey
Faso	McCaul	Wagner
Ferguson	McClintock	Walberg
Fleischmann	McHenry	Walden
Flores	McKinley	Walker
Fortenberry	McMorris	Walorski
Fox	Rodgers	Walters, Mimi
Franks (AZ)	McSally	Weber (TX)
Frelinghuysen	Meadows	Webster (FL)
Gaetz	Meehan	Wenstrup
Gallagher	Messer	Westerman
Garrett	Mitchell	Williams
Gianforte	Moolenaar	Wilson (SC)
Gibbs	Mooney (WV)	Wittman
Gohmert	Mullin	Womack
Gonzalez (TX)	Murphy (PA)	Woodall
Goodlatte	Newhouse	Yoder
Gosar	Noem	Yoho
Gowdy	Norman	Young (AK)
Granger	Nunes	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—6

Costello (PA)	Hollingsworth	Napolitano
Cummings	Jeffries	Scalise

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2303

Mr. WELCH changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 39 OFFERED BY MR. NORCROSS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. NORCROSS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 186, noes 241, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 421]

AYES—186

Adams	Garamendi	Pallone
Aguilar	Gomez	Panetta
Amash	Gottheimer	Pascarell
Barragán	Green, Al	Payne
Bass	Grijalva	Pelosi
Beatty	Gutiérrez	Perlmutter
Bera	Hanabusa	Peters
Beyer	Hastings	Pingree
Bishop (GA)	Heck	Pocan
Blum	Higgins (NY)	Polis
Blumenauer	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Blunt Rochester	Huffman	Quigley
Bonamici	Jackson Lee	Raskin
Boyle, Brendan	Jayapal	Reichert
F.	Johnson (GA)	Rice (NY)
Brady (PA)	Johnson, E. B.	Rice (SC)
Brooks (AL)	Katko	Ros-Lehtinen
Brown (MD)	Keating	Rosen
Brownley (CA)	Kelly (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Bustos	Kennedy	Ruiz
Butterfield	Khanna	Ruppersberger
Capuano	Kihuen	Rush
Carbajal	Kildee	Ryan (OH)
Cárdenas	Kilmer	Sánchez
Carson (IN)	Kind	Sanford
Cartwright	King (IA)	Sarbanes
Castor (FL)	Krishnamoorthi	Schakowsky
Castro (TX)	Kuster (NH)	Schiff
Chu, Judy	Langevin	Schrader
Ciциlline	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Clark (MA)	Lawrence	Scott, David
Clarke (NY)	Lawson (FL)	Lee
Clay	Levin	Serrano
Cleaver	Lewis (GA)	Sewell (AL)
Clyburn	Lieu, Ted	Shea-Porter
Cohen	Lipinski	Sherman
Connolly	Loeb sack	Sires
Conyers	Lofgren	Slaughter
Cooper	Lowenthal	Smith (WA)
Crist	Lowe y	Soto
Crowley	Lujan Grisham,	Speier
Curbelo (FL)	M.	Suo zzi
Davis (CA)	Luján, Ben Ray	Swalwell (CA)
Davis, Danny	Lynch	Takano
DeFazio	Maloney,	Titus
DeGette	Carolyn B.	Tonko
Delaney	Maloney, Sean	Torres
DelBene	Matsui	Tsongas
Demings	McCollum	Vargas
DeSaulnier	McEachin	Veasey
Deutch	McGovern	Vela
Dingell	McNerney	Velázquez
Doggett	Meeks	Visclosky
Ellison	Meng	Walz
Engel	Moore	Wasserman
Eshoo	Moulton	Schultz
Espallat	Murphy (FL)	Waters, Maxine
Evans	Nadler	Watson Coleman
Fitzpatrick	Neal	Welch
Foster	Nolan	Wilson (FL)
Frankel (FL)	Norcross	Yarmuth
Fudge	O'Halleran	Young (IA)
Gabbard	O'Rourke	
Gallego		

NOES—241

Abraham	Amodei	Bacon
Aderholt	Arrington	Banks (IN)
Allen	Babin	Barletta

Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Cuellar
Culberson
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Esty (CT)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Fox
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (TX)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)

Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Himes
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
Olson

Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Renacci
Richmond
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Schneider
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—6

Costello (PA)
Cummings

Hollingsworth
Jeffries

Napolitano
Scalise

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2306

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 44 OFFERED BY MS. ESTY OF CONNECTICUT

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the

gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms.
ESTY) on which further proceedings
were postponed and on which the noes
prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 203, noes 224,
not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 422]

AYES—203

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Bacon
Barragán
Bass
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blum
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brooks (AL)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Español
Espinosa
Esty (CT)
Evans
Faso
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Gabbard

Galleo
Garamendi
Gomez
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildeer
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (IL)
Kishimoto
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebach
Loftgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Mast
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halloran
O'Rourke

Pallone
Panetta
Pascarella
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Poliquin
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reed
Reichert
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradner
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Stefanik
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Upton
Vargas
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Young (IA)

NOES—224

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen

Amodei
Arrington
Babin

Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr

Barton
Beatty
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Correa
Cramer
Crawford
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Flores
Fox
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (TX)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)

Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lewis (MN)
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
Olson

Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Posey
Ratcliffe
Renacci
Richmond
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Valadao
Veasey
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—6

Costello (PA)
Cummings

Hollingsworth
Jeffries

Napolitano
Scalise

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2309

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 52 OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from California (Mr.
GARAMENDI) on which further pro-
ceedings were postponed and on which
the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 180, noes 247, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 423]

AYES—180

Adams	Frankel (FL)	Norcross
Aguilar	Fudge	O'Rourke
Amash	Gabbard	Pallone
Barragán	Gallego	Panetta
Bass	Garamendi	Pascarell
Beatty	Gomez	Payne
Bera	Gonzalez (TX)	Pelosi
Beyer	Green, Al	Perlmutter
Bishop (GA)	Green, Gene	Peters
Blumenauer	Grijalva	Pingree
Blunt Rochester	Gutiérrez	Pocan
Bonamici	Hanabusa	Polis
Boyle, Brendan	Hastings	Price (NC)
F.	Heck	Quigley
Brady (PA)	Higgins (NY)	Raskin
Brown (MD)	Himes	Rice (NY)
Brownley (CA)	Huffman	Richmond
Bustos	Jackson Lee	Rosen
Butterfield	Jayapal	Roybal-Allard
Capuano	Johnson (GA)	Ruiz
Carbajal	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Cárdenas	Kaptur	Ryan (OH)
Carson (IN)	Keating	Sánchez
Cartwright	Kelly (IL)	Sarbanes
Castor (FL)	Kennedy	Schakowsky
Castro (TX)	Khanna	Schiff
Chu, Judy	Kihuen	Schneider
Cicilline	Kildee	Schrader
Clark (MA)	Kilmer	Scott (VA)
Clarke (NY)	Kind	Scott, David
Clay	Krishnamoorthi	Serrano
Cleaver	Kuster (NH)	Sewell (AL)
Clyburn	Langevin	Shea-Porter
Cohen	Larsen (WA)	Sherman
Connolly	Larson (CT)	Sires
Conyers	Lawrence	Slaughter
Correa	Lawson (FL)	Smith (WA)
Costa	Lee	Soto
Courtney	Levin	Speier
Crowley	Lewis (GA)	Speier
Cuellar	Lieu, Ted	Suozi
Davis (CA)	Lipinski	Takano
Davis, Danny	Loeback	Thompson (CA)
DeFazio	Lofgren	Thompson (MS)
DeGette	Lowenthal	Titus
Delaney	Lowe	Tonko
DeLauro	Lynch	Torres
DelBene	Maloney,	Tsongas
Demings	Carolyn B.	Vargas
DeSaulnier	Matsui	Veasey
Deutch	McCollum	Vela
Dingell	McEachin	Velázquez
Doggett	McGovern	Visclosky
Doyle, Michael	McNerney	Walz
F.	Meeks	Wasserman
Ellison	Meng	Schultz
Engel	Moore	Waters, Maxine
Eshoo	Moulton	Watson Coleman
Espallat	Murphy (FL)	Welch
Esty (CT)	Nadler	Wilson (FL)
Evans	Neal	Yarmuth
Foster	Nolan	

NOES—247

Abraham	Blackburn	Chabot
Aderholt	Blum	Cheney
Allen	Bost	Coffman
Amodei	Brady (TX)	Cole
Arrington	Brat	Collins (GA)
Babin	Bridenstine	Collins (NY)
Bacon	Brooks (AL)	Comer
Banks (IN)	Brooks (IN)	Comstock
Barletta	Buchanan	Conaway
Barr	Buck	Cook
Barton	Bucshon	Cooper
Bergman	Budd	Cramer
Biggs	Burgess	Crawford
Bilirakis	Byrne	Crist
Bishop (MI)	Calvert	Culberson
Bishop (UT)	Carter (GA)	Curbelo (FL)
Black	Carter (TX)	Davidson

Davis, Rodney	Kelly (PA)	Roe (TN)
Denham	King (IA)	Rogers (AL)
Dent	King (NY)	Rogers (KY)
DeSantis	Kinzing	Rohrabacher
DesJarlais	Knight	Rokita
Diaz-Balart	Kustoff (TN)	Rooney, Francis
Donovan	Labrador	Rooney, Thomas
Duffy	LaHood	J.
Duncan (SC)	LaMalfa	Ros-Lehtinen
Duncan (TN)	Lamborn	Roskam
Dunn	Lance	Ross
Emmer	Latta	Rothfus
Estes (KS)	Lewis (MN)	Rouzer
Farenthold	LoBiondo	Royce (CA)
Faso	Long	Ruppersberger
Ferguson	Loudermilk	Russell
Fitzpatrick	Love	Rutherford
Fleischmann	Lucas	Sanford
Flores	Luetkemeyer	Schweikert
Fortenberry	Lujan Grisham,	Scott, Austin
Fox	M.	Sensenbrenner
Franks (AZ)	Luján, Ben Ray	Sessions
Frelinghuysen	MacArthur	Shimkus
Gaetz	Maloney, Sean	Shuster
Gallagher	Marchant	Simpson
Garrett	Marino	Sinema
Gianforte	Marshall	Smith (MO)
Gibbs	Massie	Smith (NE)
Gohmert	Mast	Smith (NJ)
Goodlatte	McCarthy	Smith (TX)
Gosar	McCauley	Smucker
Gottheimer	McClintock	Stefanik
Gowdy	McHenry	Stewart
Granger	McKinley	Stivers
Graves (GA)	McMorris	Swalwell (CA)
Graves (LA)	Rodgers	Taylor
Graves (MO)	McSally	Tenney
Griffith	Meadows	Thompson (PA)
Grothman	Meehan	Thornberry
Guthrie	Messer	Tiberi
Handel	Mitchell	Tipton
Harper	Mooleenaar	Trott
Harris	Mooney (WV)	Turner
Hartzler	Mullin	Upton
Hensarling	Murphy (PA)	Valadao
Herrera Beutler	Newhouse	Wagner
Hice, Jody B.	Noem	Walberg
Higgins (LA)	Norman	Walden
Hill	Nunes	Walker
Holding	O'Halleran	Walorski
Hoyer	Olson	Walters, Mimi
Hudson	Palazzo	Weber (TX)
Huizenga	Palmer	Webster (FL)
Hultgren	Paulsen	Wenstrup
Hunter	Pearce	Westerman
Hurd	Perry	Williams
Issa	Peterson	Wilson (SC)
Jenkins (KS)	Pittenger	Wittman
Jenkins (WV)	Poe (TX)	Womack
Johnson (LA)	Poliquin	Woodall
Johnson (OH)	Posey	Yoder
Johnson, Sam	Ratcliffe	Yoho
Jones	Reed	Young (AK)
Jordan	Reichert	Young (IA)
Joyce (OH)	Renacci	Zeldin
Katko	Rice (SC)	
Kelly (MS)	Roby	

NOT VOTING—6

Costello (PA)	Hollingsworth	Napolitano
Cummings	Jeffries	Scalise

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2312

Ms. KAPTUR changed her vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 54 OFFERED BY MS. PINGREE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 192, noes 235, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 424]

AYES—192

Adams	Fudge	Norcross
Aguilar	Gabbard	O'Halleran
Barragán	Gallego	O'Rourke
Bass	Garamendi	Pallone
Beatty	Gomez	Panetta
Bera	Gottheimer	Pascarell
Beyer	Green, Al	Payne
Bishop (GA)	Green, Gene	Pelosi
Blumenauer	Grijalva	Perlmutter
Blunt Rochester	Gutiérrez	Peters
Bonamici	Hanabusa	Pingree
Boyle, Brendan	Hastings	Pocan
F.	Heck	Poliquin
Brady (PA)	Higgins (NY)	Polis
Brown (MD)	Himes	Price (NC)
Brownley (CA)	Hoyer	Quigley
Bustos	Huffman	Raskin
Butterfield	Jackson Lee	Rice (NY)
Capuano	Jayapal	Richmond
Carbajal	Johnson (GA)	Rosen
Cárdenas	Johnson, E. B.	Roybal-Allard
Carson (IN)	Kaptur	Ruiz
Cartwright	Keating	Rush
Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Ruppersberger
Castro (TX)	Kennedy	Sánchez
Chu, Judy	Khanna	Sarbanes
Cicilline	Kihuen	Schakowsky
Clark (MA)	Kildee	Schiff
Clarke (NY)	Kilmer	Schneider
Clay	Kind	Schrader
Cleaver	Krishnamoorthi	Scott (VA)
Clyburn	Kuster (NH)	Scott, David
Cohen	Langevin	Serrano
Connolly	Larsen (WA)	Sewell (AL)
Conyers	Larson (CT)	Shea-Porter
Correa	Lawrence	Sherman
Costa	Lee	Sinema
Courtney	Levin	Sires
Crist	Lewis (GA)	Slaughter
Crowley	Lieu, Ted	Smith (WA)
Cuellar	Lipinski	Soto
Davis (CA)	Loeback	Speier
Davis, Danny	Lofgren	Suozi
DeFazio	Lowenthal	Swalwell (CA)
DeGette	Lowe	Takano
Delaney	Lujan Grisham,	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	M.	Thompson (MS)
DelBene	Luján, Ben Ray	Titus
Demings	Lynch	Tonko
DeSaulnier	Maloney,	Torres
Deutch	Carolyn B.	Tsongas
Dingell	Maloney, Sean	Vargas
Doggett	Matsui	Veasey
Doyle, Michael	McCollum	Vela
F.	McEachin	Velázquez
Ellison	McGovern	Visclosky
Engel	McNerney	Walz
Eshoo	Meeks	Wasserman
Espallat	Meng	Schultz
Esty (CT)	Moore	Waters, Maxine
Evans	Moulton	Watson Coleman
Fitzpatrick	Murphy (FL)	Welch
Fortenberry	Nadler	Wilson (FL)
Foster	Neal	Yarmuth
Frankel (FL)	Nolan	

NOES—235

Abraham	Bishop (UT)	Calvert
Aderholt	Black	Carter (GA)
Allen	Blackburn	Carter (TX)
Amash	Blum	Chabot
Amodei	Bost	Cheney
Arrington	Brady (TX)	Coffman
Babin	Brat	Cole
Bacon	Bridenstine	Collins (GA)
Banks (IN)	Brooks (AL)	Collins (NY)
Barletta	Brooks (IN)	Comer
Barr	Buchanan	Comstock
Barton	Buck	Conaway
Bergman	Bucshon	Cook
Biggs	Budd	Cramer
Bilirakis	Burgess	Crawford
Bishop (MI)	Byrne	Culberson

Curbelo (FL) Joyce (OH)
 Davidson Katko
 Davis, Rodney Kelly (MS)
 Denham Kelly (PA)
 Dent King (IA)
 DeSantis King (NY)
 DesJarlais Kinzinger
 Diaz-Balart Knight
 Donovan Kustoff (TN)
 Duffy Labrador
 Duncan (SC) LaHood
 Duncan (TN) LaMalfa
 Dunn Lamborn
 Emmer Lance
 Estes (KS) Latta
 Farenthold Lewis (MN)
 Faso LoBiondo
 Ferguson Long
 Fleischmann Loudermilk
 Flores Love
 Foxx Lucas
 Franks (AZ) Luetkemeyer
 Frelinghuysen MacArthur
 Gaetz Marchant
 Gallagher Marino
 Garrett Marshall
 Gianforte Massie
 Gibbs Mast
 Gohmert McCarthy
 Gonzalez (TX) McCaul
 Goodlatte McClintock
 Gosar McHenry
 Gowdy McKinley
 Granger McMorris
 Graves (GA) Rodgers
 Graves (LA) McCally
 Graves (MO) Meadows
 Griffith Meehan
 Grothman Tipton
 Guthrie Mitchell
 Handel Moolenaar
 Harper Mooney (WV)
 Harris Mullin
 Hartzler Murphy (PA)
 Hensarling Newhouse
 Herrera Beutler Noem
 Hice, Jody B. Norman
 Higgins (LA) Nunes
 Hill Olson
 Holding Palazzo
 Hudson Palmer
 Huizenga Paulsen
 Hultgren Pearce
 Hunter Perry
 Hurd Peterson
 Issa Pittenger
 Jenkins (KS) Poe (TX)
 Jenkins (WV) Posey
 Johnson (LA) Ratcliffe
 Johnson (OH) Reed
 Johnson, Sam Reichert
 Jones Renacci
 Jordan Rice (SC)

NOT VOTING—6

Costello (PA) Hollingsworth Napolitano
 Cummings Jeffries Scalise

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2315

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 56 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON
 LEE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
 business is the demand for a recorded
 vote on the amendment offered by the
 gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON
 LEE) on which further proceedings were
 postponed and on which the noes pre-
 vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
 amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
 ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
 has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
 minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
 vice, and there were—ayes 234, noes 192,
 not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 425]

AYES—234

Abraham Garamendi Norcross
 Adams Gomez O'Halleran
 Aguilar Gonzalez (TX) O'Rourke
 Barragán Granger Olson
 Bass Graves (LA) Pallone
 Beatty Green, Al Panetta
 Bera Green, Gene Pascarelli
 Beyer Grijalva Paulsen
 Blumenauer Gutiérrez Payne
 Blunt Rochester Hanabusa Pelosi
 Bonamici Hartzler Perlmutter
 Boyle, Brendan Hastings Peters
 F. Heck Pingree
 Brady (PA) Herrera Beutler Pocan
 Brooks (IN) Higgins (LA) Poe (TX)
 Brown (MD) Higgins (NY) Polis
 Brownley (CA) Himes Price (NC)
 Bustos Hoyer Quigley
 Butterfield Huffman Raskin
 Capuano Hurd Rice (NY)
 Carbajal Jackson Lee Rice (SC)
 Cárdenas Jayapal Rooney, Thomas
 Carson (IN) Jenkins (WV) J.
 Carter (TX) Johnson (GA) Ros-Lehtinen
 Cartwright Johnson (LA) Rosen
 Castor (FL) Johnson, E. B. Roybal-Allard
 Castro (TX) Kaptur Ruiz
 Chu, Judy Katko Ruppersberger
 Cicilline Keating Rush
 Clark (MA) Kelly (IL) Ryan (OH)
 Clarke (NY) Kennedy Sánchez
 Clay Khanna Sarbanes
 Cleaver Kihuen Schakowsky
 Clyburn Kildee Schiff
 Coffman Kilmer Schneider
 Cohen King (NY) Schrader
 Collins (GA) Kinzinger Scott (VA)
 Connolly Krishnamoorthi Scott, David
 Conyers Kuster (NH) Serrano
 Cooper Langevin Sewell (AL)
 Correa Larsen (WA) Shea-Porter
 Costa Larson (CT) Sherman
 Courtney Lawrence Simpson
 Crist Lawson (FL) Sinema
 Crowley Lee Sires
 Cuellar Levin Slaughter
 Culberson Lewis (GA) Smith (TX)
 Woodall Curbelo (FL) Smith (WA)
 Davis (CA) Davis, Danny Soto
 Davis, Danny DeFazio Stivers
 DeFazio Loebsack Suozzi
 DeGette Lofgren Swalwell (CA)
 Delaney Lowenthal Takano
 DeLauro Lowey Tenney
 DeBene Lujan Grisham, M.
 Demings M. Thompson (CA)
 Dent Luján, Ben Ray Thompson (MS)
 DeSaulnier Lynch Titus
 Deutch MacArthur Tonko
 Diaz-Balart Maloney, Carolyn B. Trott
 Dingell Carolyn B. Tsongas
 Doggett Marchant Upton
 Donovan Matsui Vargas
 Doyle, Michael McCaul Veasey
 F. McColm Vela
 Ellison McEachin Velázquez
 Engel McGovern Visclosky
 Eshoo McKinley Wagner
 Español McNeer Walker
 Esty (CT) McCally Walorski
 Evans Meehan Walz
 Farenthold Meeks Wasserman
 Faso Meng Schultz
 Fitzpatrick Moore Waters, Maxine
 Flores Moulton Watson Coleman
 Fortenberry Foster Weber (TX)
 Foster Murphy (FL) Welch
 Frankel (FL) Nadler Wilson (FL)
 Gabbard Neal Yarmuth
 Gallego Nolan Young (IA)

NOES—192

Aderholt Banks (IN) Bishop (GA)
 Allen Barletta Bishop (MI)
 Amash Barr Bishop (UT)
 Amodei Barton Black
 Arrington Bergman Blackburn
 Babin Biggs Blum
 Bacon Bilirakis Bost

Hice, Jody B. Hill
 Holding Posey
 Hudson Ratcliffe
 Buchanan Reed
 Buck Reichert
 Bucshon Hunter Renacci
 Budd Richmond
 Burgess Issa Roby
 Byrne Jenkins (KS) Roe (TN)
 Calvert Johnson (OH) Rogers (AL)
 Carter (GA) Johnson, Sam Rogers (KY)
 Chabot Jones Rohrabacher
 Cheney Jordan Rokita
 Cole Joyce (OH) Rooney, Francis
 Collins (NY) Kelly (MS) Roskam
 Comer Kelly (PA) Ross
 Comstock Kind Rothfus
 Conaway King (IA) Rouzer
 Cook Knight Royce (CA)
 Cramer Kustoff (TN) Russell
 Crawford Labrador
 Davidson LaHood
 Davis, Rodney LaMalfa
 Denham Lamborn
 DeSantis Lance
 DesJarlais Latta
 Duffy Lewis (MN)
 Duncan (SC) Long
 Duncan (TN) Loudermilk
 Dunn Love
 Emmer Lucas
 Estes (KS) Luetkemeyer
 Ferguson Malone, Sean
 Fleischmann Marino
 Foxx Marshall
 Franks (AZ) Mast
 Frelinghuysen McCarthy
 Fudge McClintock
 Gaetz McHenry
 Gallagher McMorris
 Garrett Rodgers
 Gianforte Meadows
 Gibbs Messer
 Gohmert Mitchell
 Goodlatte Moolenaar
 Gosar Mullin
 Gottheimer Murphy (PA)
 Gowdy Newhouse
 Graves (GA) Noem
 Graves (MO) Norman
 Griffith Nunes
 Grothman Palazzo
 Guthrie Palmer
 Handel Pearce
 Harper Perry
 Harris Peterson
 Hensarling Pittenger

NOT VOTING—7

Costello (PA) Jeffries Torres
 Cummings Napolitano
 Hollingsworth Scalise

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2320

Messrs. THOMAS J. ROONEY of
 Florida, KATKO, HIGGINS of Lou-
 isiana, JENKINS of West Virginia, and
 MOONEY of West Virginia changed
 their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 57 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON
 LEE

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. WALKER). It
 is now in order to consider amendment
 No. 57 printed in House Report 115–259.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I
 have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will
 designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as fol-
 lows:

At the end of division D, before the short
 title, insert the following:

SEC. _____. The amounts otherwise provided
 by this Act are revised by reducing the
 amount made available for “Corps of Engi-
 neers-Civil—Construction”, and increasing

the amount made available for the same account, by \$100,000,000.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 473, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I again thank the chairman and the ranking member of the subcommittee for this very critical work.

My amendment speaks to the need for robust funding for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' construction account by redirecting \$100 million for increased funding for critical construction projects like those projects that are current and future projects throughout the Nation.

As a Federal agency that collects and studies basic information pertaining to river and harbor, and flood and storm damage reduction, it is important that the Army Corps of Engineers and the construction unit have the funding to focus its resources around the Nation again.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers plays a critical role in the building, maintaining, and expanding of the most critical of the Nation's infrastructures.

The Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee has an important responsibility, and it is to ensure the safety of the Nation's waterways.

Some of these waterways are in and around many of our States, particularly in the State of Texas. Not only do we have a concept of bayous, but, for example, we are surrounded in many parts by the Gulf. We have an enormous amount of water in rivers, and the Army Corps of Engineers is particularly important as it relates to flooding.

But we have seen flooding across America. So this particular amendment is to ensure that resources are there as Americans face unusual flooding that has been occurring over the last decades.

I will give you an example. During May 2015, in the Houston flood, 3,015 homes were flooded and eight people died. During the April 2016 Houston flood, 5,400 homes were flooded and eight deaths were recorded. The economic damage caused by the 2015 Houston flood is estimated at \$3 billion.

I want my colleagues to know that this amendment is not for a region or an area. It is really to help the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to conclude by simply thanking the committee and staff and, again, reminding individuals that we can save lives through the work of the Army Corps of Engineers in stopping flooding that impacts not only my region of the country, but really across the country.

I conclude with one final statement: We in our community are entering hurricane season. This will be a very important amendment as we enter hurricane season all over the Nation.

Mr. Chair, I want to thank Chairman SIMPSON and Ranking Member KAPTUR for shepherding this legislation to the floor and for their commitment to preserving America's great natural environment and resources so that they can serve and be enjoyed by generations to come.

My amendment speaks to the need for robust funding for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers "Construction" account by redirecting \$100 million for increased funding for critical construction projects, like those current and future projects proposed for the Houston/Harris County metropolitan area.

As the federal agency that collects and studies basic information pertaining to river and harbor, flood and storm damage reduction, shore protection, aquatic ecosystem restoration, and conducts detailed studies, plans, and specifications for river and harbor, and flood and storm damage reduction, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineer plays a critical role in the building, maintaining, and expanding the most critical of the nation's infrastructure.

We understand this very well in my home state of Texas and the Eighteenth Congressional District that I represent.

The Army Corps of Engineers has been working with the Harris County Flood Control District since 1937 to reduce the risk of flooding within Harris County.

Current projects include 6 federal flood risk management projects:

1. Sims Bayou
2. Greens Bayou
3. Brays Bayou
4. White Oak Bayou
5. Hunting Bayou, and
6. Clear Creek.

In addition to these ongoing projects, the Army Corps of Engineers operates and maintains the Addicks and Barker (A&B) Detention Dams in northwest Harris County.

Such a study is certainly needed given the frequency and severity of historic-level flood events in recent years in and around the Houston metropolitan area, it is clear that much more needs to be done to minimize the vulnerability of the nation's 4th largest metropolitan area and economic engine from the flood damage.

On April 15, 2016, an estimated 240 billion gallons of water fell in the Houston area over a 12 hour period, which resulted in several areas exceeding the 100 to 500 year flood event record.

The areas that experienced these historic rain falls were west of I-45, north of I-10, and Greens Bayou.

Additionally, an estimated 140 billion gallons of water fell over the Cypress Creek, Spring Creek, and Addicks watershed in just 14 hours.

Mr. Chair, during the May 2015 Houston flood, 3,015 homes were flooded and 8 persons died; during the April 2016 Houston flood, 5,400 homes were flooded and 8 deaths recorded.

The economic damage caused by the 2015 Houston flood is estimated at \$3 billion; the 2016 estimate is being compiled and is estimated to be well above \$2 billion.

Mr. Chair, minimizing the risk of flood damage to the Houston and Harris County metropolitan area, the nation's 4th largest, is a matter of national significance because the region is one of the nation's major technology, energy, finance, export and medical centers:

1. Port of Houston is the largest bulk port in the world;

2. Texas Medical Center is a world renowned teaching, research and treatment center;

3. Houston is home to the largest conglomeration of foreign bank representation and second only to New York City as home to the most Fortune 500 companies; and

4. The Houston Watershed Assessment study area sits within major Hurricane Evacuation arteries for the larger Galveston Gulf Coast region.

I ask my colleagues to join me and support Jackson Lee Amendment No. 57.

I thank Chairman SIMPSON and Ranking Member KAPTUR for their work in shepherding this bill to the floor.

Mr. Chairman, I ask support for the Jackson Lee amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 58 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 58 printed in House Report 115-259.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division D (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act for "Department of Energy—Energy Programs—Science" may be used in contravention of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 473, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is a very simple amendment that promotes STEM education, which is really a vital part of the future of this Nation.

In particular, my amendment says: "None of the funds made available by this act for 'Department of Energy—Energy Programs—Science' may be used in contravention of the Department of Energy Organization Act."

This amendment was approved and adopted just in the last session. Twenty years ago, on February 11, we were directed to identify and address the disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of their actions on minority and low-income populations.

The Department of Energy ceased to provide equal access in these opportunities for underrepresented groups in STEM, including minorities, Native Americans, and women.

Mr. Chairman, women and minorities make up 70 percent of college students, but only 45 percent of undergraduates

are STEM degree holders. This large pool of untapped talent is a great potential source of STEM professional, but it also deprives the United States of its best minds to be able to help it in the 21st century.

As the Nation's demographics are shifting and now more children under the age of 1 are minorities, it is critical that we close the gap in the number of minorities who seek system opportunities.

Mr. Chairman, there are still a great many scientific riddles left to be solved. And perhaps one of these days, a minority engineer or biologist will come up with some of the solutions.

As many have done in the past, the larger point is that we need more STEM educators and more minorities to qualify them. My amendment turns our importance to the importance of energy and science education programs, funded in part by this bill, and will help to ensure that members of underrepresented communities are not placed at a disadvantage when it comes to environmental sustainability, preservation, and health.

□ 2330

Mr. Chairman, in closing, let me take note of some of the colleagues that I have had the privilege of being neighbors to. NASA's Johnson Space Center is, if I might say, one of the neighbors of my community, great respect for the astronauts; Major Bolden, who serves as head of NASA; and Mae Jemison is my neighbor, the first African-American woman who went into space. I want more of those individuals coming from our Nation's schools, and I ask my colleagues to support this amendment that will encourage those in low-income communities and minorities, Native Americans, and others to join in and support the opportunities for STEM education.

Mr. Chair, I want to thank Chairman SIMPSON and Ranking Member KAPTUR for shepherding this legislation to the floor and for their commitment to preserving America's great natural environment and resources so that they can serve and be enjoyed by generations to come.

Jackson Lee Amendment No. 58 simply provides that:

"None of the funds made available by this Act for 'Department of Energy—Energy Programs—Science' be used in contravention of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.)."

This amendment was approved and adopted in identical form on April 29, 2015, during the 114th Congress as an amendment to H.R. 2028, the Energy and Water Resources Appropriations Act of 2016.

Mr. Chair, twenty years ago, on February 11, 1994, President Clinton issued Executive Order 12898, directing federal agencies to identify and address the disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of their actions on minority and low-income populations.

The Department of Energy seeks to provide equal access in these opportunities for underrepresented groups in STEM, including minorities, Native Americans, and women.

Mr. Chair, women and minorities make up 70 percent of college students, but only 45 percent of undergraduate STEM degree holders.

This large pool of untapped talent is a great potential source of STEM professionals.

As the nation's demographics are shifting and now most children under the age of one are minorities, it is critical that we close the gap in the number of minorities who seek STEM opportunities.

I encourage Energy Secretary Perry to surpass the commitment of his predecessors' toward increasing the nation's economic competitiveness and enabling more of our people to realize their full potential.

Mr. Chair, there are still a great many scientific riddles left to be solved—and perhaps one of these days a minority engineer or biologist will come up with some of the solutions.

The larger point is that we need more STEM educators and more minorities to qualify for them.

The energy and science education programs funded in part by this bill will help ensure that members of underrepresented communities are not placed at a disadvantage when it comes to the environmental sustainability, preservation, and health.

Through education about the importance of environmental sustainability, we can promote a broader understanding of science and how citizens can improve their surroundings.

Through community education efforts, teachers and students have also benefitted by learning about radiation, radioactive waste management, and other related subjects.

The Department of Energy places interns and volunteers from minority institutions into energy efficiency and renewable energy programs.

The DOE also works to increase low income and minority access to STEM fields and help students attain graduate degrees as well as find employment.

With the continuation of this kind of funding, we can increase diversity, provide clean energy options to our most underserved communities, and help improve their environments, which will yield better health outcomes and greater public awareness.

But most importantly businesses will have more consumers to whom they may engage in related commercial activities.

My amendment will help ensure that underrepresented communities are able to participate and contribute equitably in the energy and scientific future.

I ask my colleagues to join me and support Jackson Lee Amendment No. 58.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for support of the Jackson Lee amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 59 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 59 printed in House Report 115-259.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division D (before the short title), insert the following:

Sec. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to prepare, propose, or promulgate any regulation or guidance that references or relies on the analysis contained in—

(1) "Technical Support Document: Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis Under Executive Order 12866", published by the Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Carbon, United States Government, in February 2010;

(2) "Technical Support Document: Technical Update of the Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis Under Executive Order 12866", published by the Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Carbon, United States Government, in May 2013 and revised in November 2013;

(3) "Revised Draft Guidance for Federal Departments and Agencies on Consideration of Greenhouse Gas Emissions and the Effects of Climate Change in NEPA Reviews", published by the Council on Environmental Quality on December 24, 2014 (79 Fed. Reg. 77801);

(4) "Technical Support Document: Technical Update of the Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis Under Executive Order 12866", published by the Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Carbon, United States Government, in July 2015;

(5) "Addendum to the Technical Support Document on Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis Under Executive Order 12866: Application of the Methodology to Estimate the Social Cost of Methane and the Social Cost of Nitrous Oxide", published by the Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Greenhouse Gases, United States Government, in August 2016; or

(6) "Technical Support Document: Technical Update of the Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis Under Executive Order 12866", published by the Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Greenhouse Gases, United States Government, in August 2016.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 473, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer a commonsense amendment that will protect American jobs and the economy by prohibiting funds from being used to implement the Obama administration's flawed Social Cost of Carbon, or SCC, valuation. This job-killing and unlawful guidance sneakily attempts to pave the way for cap-and-trade-like mandates.

Congress and the American people have repeatedly rejected cap-and-trade proposals. Knowing that he could not lawfully enact a carbon tax plan, President Obama attempted to circumvent Congress by playing loose and fast with the Clean Air Act to unilaterally implement this unlawful new requirement under the guise of guidance.

The Obama administration continuously used the SCC valuation models, which can be easily manipulated, to try and justify new job-killing regulations.

Although President Trump issued an executive order in March to disband the Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Greenhouse Gases, Federal

agencies continue to work on the SCC valuation.

My amendment is necessary to strengthen the intent of President Trump's executive order while also ensuring that it is Congress, not the executive branch, which sets tax and environmental policy.

The committee wisely issued guidance in the bill report to delay the promulgation of SCC regulations until a new working group is convened. My amendment explicitly prohibits funds from being used to implement the deeply flawed Social Cost of Carbon guidance in the bill text.

The House has a clear, consistent, and strong record of opposition to the Social Cost of Carbon. My colleagues voted in favor of my amendment in FY17 appropriations by a clear majority of 230-188.

In fact, the House has decisively voted 10 times to block, defund, or oppose the Social Cost of Carbon since 2013. My amendment ensures this Chamber's position remains consistent and crystal clear in FY18.

Roger Martella, a self-described lifelong environmentalist and career environmental lawyer, testified at the May 2015 House Natural Resources Committee hearing on the revised SCC guidance and the flaws associated with the Social Cost of Carbon model, stating that the "Social Cost of Carbon" estimates suffer from a number of significant flaws that should exclude them from the NEPA process."

Amongst these flaws are, one, that the "projected costs of carbon emissions can be manipulated by changing key parameters such as timeframes, discount rates, and other values that have no relation to a given project undergoing review."

Two, "OMB and the other Federal agencies developed the draft Social Cost of Carbon estimates without any known peer review or opportunity for public comment during the development process."

Three, "OMB's draft Social Cost of Carbon estimates are based primarily on global rather than domestic costs and benefits."

Four, "there is still considerable uncertainty in many of the assumptions and data elements used to create the draft Social Cost of Carbon estimates, such as the damage functions and modeled time horizons."

Mr. Martella's testimony was spot on. Congress, not Washington bureaucrats, should dictate our country's climate change policy. The sweeping and costly changes that the Social Cost of Carbon metric would impose are not only misguided and unwise, they are also based on fundamentally flawed policies that sidestepped Congress, did not go through the normal regulatory process, and received no public comment.

Worse yet, the model utilized to predict the Social Cost of Carbon can be easily manipulated to arrive at the desired outcome.

Regardless of one's positions on climate change, my colleagues surely must respect the constitutional role of the legislative branch and oppose bureaucratic efforts to circumvent Congress to impose an extremist environmental agenda that is not based on best available science.

Congress must provide certainty to business and consumers that the costly and scientifically bankrupt Social Cost of Carbon valuation will not creep its way into our regulatory process.

My amendment provides that certainty.

Over the last 2 years, this effort has received support from the American Energy Alliance, Americans for Limited Government, Americans for Tax Reform, Arch Coal, Competitive Enterprise Institute, the Council for Citizens Against Government Waste, FreedomWorks, National Mining Association, the National Taxpayers Union, and Taxpayers Protection Alliance.

Congress, not anonymous Washington bureaucrats, should dictate our country's tax and climate change policy. I urge my colleagues to support my amendment to, once again, block the flawed Social Cost of Carbon.

I commend the chairman and the committee for their efforts on this legislation, and I urge support of my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman has a point of view that I do not support, but in terms of this amendment, it really is not necessary. It is redundant. On March 28 of this year, Executive Order No. 13783, signed by President Donald Trump, has rescinded every one of the analyses that the gentleman referenced in his proposed amendment. So this amendment does less than nothing. It has already been dealt with through executive order.

I would just encourage my colleagues to let's move the agenda along this evening where we will have significant debate perhaps on other matters.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment because it is redundant at this point, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I want to reiterate even though President Trump issued an executive order in March to disband the Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Greenhouse Gases, Federal agencies continue to work on the SCC valuation. So I, at the very least, would expect everybody to support this.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 60 OFFERED BY MS. DELBENE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 60 printed in House Report 115-259.

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division D, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this division may be used for the procurement of anchor chain that is not subject to the restrictions in section 225.7007-1 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 473, the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington.

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an important amendment to this year's Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill. It fixes a serious problem that must be addressed to protect hardworking Americans in my district and across the country.

Both parties can agree that our Nation should be spending taxpayer dollars on goods manufactured here at home, not overseas, whenever we can. Doing so not only supports American jobs in our communities but also reinforces our national security. Even President Trump called for strengthening enforcing laws that promote American industry and American workers. So I hope my colleagues from both sides of the aisle can come together on this issue.

Particularly in these uncertain times, it is imperative that we protect American production capabilities by supporting U.S. manufacturers.

Every year since 1991, Congress has included a provision in the Department of Defense Appropriations bill to require that military agencies purchase anchor chain from American businesses. For the last 2 years, the House and Senate have supported an amendment of mine clarifying that this requirement applies to the Army Corps of Engineers. Unfortunately, the Corps has continued to ignore clear congressional intent and has made several acquisitions of foreign-made anchor chain from countries like China and Korea.

Until the Army Corps follows the policy, I will keep fighting to support U.S. manufacturers and their workers, and I hope the whole Chamber will join me in this effort.

My amendment strengthens the existing language in this bill to better protect the critical production capability, support our manufacturing industry, and put American workers first.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I recognize the underlying bill has language on this issue, but I understand that the requirement may not be as comprehensive as my colleague supports. I am concerned that the amendment before us may have unintended consequences. If my colleague would withdraw the amendment today, I will commit to working together as this bill moves through the legislative process to see if we can address her concerns in a manner acceptable to everyone. Otherwise, I will have to oppose the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the intent of the gentlewoman's amendment. I am very glad to hear what the gentlewoman is saying. She is trying to do everything she can to support American-made products and particularly American-made anchor chain. I would be willing to work with the chairman and the gentlewoman as the process goes forward to ensure we purchase American-made products. I just wanted to express that support. I thank the gentleman for his offer.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman is willing to withdraw the amendment, we will work together to see if we can solve this.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's willingness to work with me on this important issue and also Representative KAPTUR for her support.

Our Nation can't afford to lose its critical production capability. We should not allow American workers to be left behind, so I look forward to working with the gentleman and the gentlewoman.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time, and I withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 61 OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 61 printed in House Report 115-259.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division D (before the short title) insert the following new section:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this division may be used—

(1) to implement or enforce section 430.32(x) of title 10, Code of Federal Regulations; or

(2) to implement or enforce the standards established by the tables contained in section 325(i)(1)(B) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6295(i)(1)(B))

with respect to BPAR incandescent reflector lamps, BR incandescent reflector lamps, and ER incandescent reflector lamps.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 473, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to prevent the distortion of the free market by the Federal Government.

Since its passage in 2007 of the Energy Independence and Security Act, I have heard from virtually tens of thousands of constituents about the language in that act and how it will take away consumer choice when constituents are deciding which lightbulbs they will use in their homes. Mr. Chairman, they are right.

Mr. Chairman, in the interest of time, I want to point out this exact amendment has been accepted for the past 6 years by the House. Three of those years it was accepted by voice vote. It was included in the annual appropriations legislation signed into law by President Obama every year since its first inclusion in 2011, and has been a priority of the Republican Conference since its adoption into law. It allows consumers to continue to have a choice and to have a say about what type of lightbulb they will put into their homes. Congress should fight to preserve the free market. It is common sense.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, with all the respect I have for Congressman BURGESS, I oppose this damaging rider which would block the Department of Energy from implementing or enforcing commonsense energy efficiency standards for lightbulbs.

This rider was a bad idea when it was first offered 7 years ago, and it is even more unsupportable now. Why do I say that? Because every claim made by proponents of the rider have been proven wrong.

Number one, we have been told, including by Dr. BURGESS, that the energy efficiency standards would ban incandescent lightbulbs. That is simply false. You can go to the store today and see shelves of modern energy efficient incandescent lightbulbs that meet the standard, and they are the same as the old bulbs except they last longer, use less electricity, and save consumers money.

Then we heard for years that the energy efficiency standards restrict consumer choice.

□ 2345

If you have shopped for lightbulbs lately, which I have, you know that isn't true. In fact, modern incandescent

bulbs, compact fluorescent lightbulbs, and LEDs of every shape, size, and color are now available.

Consumers have never had more choice, and the efficiency standard spurred innovation that dramatically expanded options for consumers. I am amazed how many shelves lightbulbs now occupy in the stores.

Critics of the efficiency standards claim that they would cost consumers money. In fact, the opposite is true. When the standards are in full effect, the average American family will save about \$100 per year. That is pretty good. That is \$12.5 billion in savings for consumers and businesses nationwide every year. That is \$12.5 billion. But this rider threatens those savings. That is why consumer groups have consistently opposed this rider.

Here is the reality. The 2007 consensus energy efficiency standards for lightbulbs were enacted with bipartisan support and continue to enjoy overwhelming industry support. U.S. manufacturers are already meeting the efficiency standards.

The effect of the rider is to allow foreign manufacturers to sell old, inefficient lightbulbs in the United States that violate the efficiency standards. That is unfair to domestic manufacturers who have invested millions of dollars in U.S. plants to make efficient bulbs that meet the standards.

Why on Earth would we want to pass a rider that favors foreign manufacturers who ignore our laws and penalize U.S. manufacturers who are following our laws?

But it gets even worse. The mere existence of this rider poses and additional threat to U.S. manufacturing. The bipartisan 2007 Energy bill required the Department of Energy to establish updated lightbulb efficiency standards by January 1 of this year. It also provided that, if final updated standards are not issued by then, a more stringent backstop standard of 45 lumens per watt automatically takes effect, and incandescent lightbulbs currently cannot meet this backstop standard.

Well, we are well into 2017, and the Burgess lightbulb rider has remained on the books. So, earlier this year, the Department of Energy had to go forward with finalizing the 45-lumens-per-watt backstop standard.

Approving this rider year after year is ultimately what blocked the Department of Energy from issuing the required efficiency standards in time to avoid such stringent measures. Ironically, it is this rider that would effectively ban the incandescent lightbulb in 2020.

The Burgess rider directly threatens existing lightbulb manufacturing jobs in the United States. It would stifle innovation and punish companies that have invested in domestic manufacturing. This rider aims to reverse years of technological progress, only to kill jobs, increase electricity bills for our consumers, and worsen pollution.

It is time to choose common sense over rigid ideology. It is time to listen to the manufacturing companies, consumer groups, and efficiency advocates who all agree that this rider is harmful.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all Members to vote "no" on the Burgess lightbulb rider, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I will disagree on the economics that were just presented. But apart from the economics of the lightbulb mandate, that is, in fact, only part of the story.

With the extreme expansion of Federal powers undertaken in the last administration, when the Democrats were in charge of Congress for 4 years, Americans have just now begun to see how far the Constitution's Commerce Clause has been manipulated from its original intent. The lightbulb mandate is a perfect example of this manipulation.

The Commerce Clause was intended by our Founding Fathers to be a limitation on Federal authority, not a catchall in order to allow for any topic to be regulated by Washington. Indeed, it is clear that the Founding Fathers never intended for this clause to be used to allow the Federal Government to regulate and pass mandates on consumer products that do not pose a risk to either human health or safety.

Mr. Chairman, in December of 2007, when this bill was first passed, the columnist George Will observed on television one Sunday morning that it is the job of the Federal Government to defend the borders and deliver the mail. But instead of keeping up with those two tasks, we instead decided to ban the incandescent bulb. It was wrong in 2007. It is wrong in 2017.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 62 OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 62 printed in House Report 115-259.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division D (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 1 percent.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 473, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to begin by thanking the committee for their hard work on this appropriations bill.

Every year, I come to this floor through the appropriations process to present amendments calling for 1 percent across-the-board cuts. So many years I have come down here to talk about how the spending continues to increase. Indeed, our budget does increase. But I have to tell you, the chairman and his team have done an incredible job this year.

The outlays that we see in this bill this year are \$209 million—think about that—less than the budget authority from last year. That is significant, and it should be recognized and should be praised, because that is the type of work that we need to see.

Now, I do continue to present the 1 percent across-the-board amendment because we are facing a time in our Nation where 1 percent makes a difference, just as we are seeing from the good work that they have done.

Passing this amendment for the 1 percent across-the-board spending reduction would save us an additional \$376 million. It is important to do because our Nation is facing \$20 trillion in debt. Because of that, we have to ask ourselves: Is it important to spend some of the money that is being spent on programs that we see taking place in the Department of Energy?

It causes us to look at these programs and talk about priorities, where we should spend those precious dollars that are not Federal dollars. They are taxpayer dollars that are coming out of the pockets of hardworking men and women.

Indeed, we have, many times, quoted Admiral Mullins' comments from July 6, 2010, that the greatest threat to our Nation's security is our Nation's debt. Because of that, I recognize and applaud the good work that has been done, but I encourage support for my amendment and the continued honing and prioritizing of what takes the taxpayer money that is spent by this body.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, let me first say that I compliment the gentlewoman for her consistency. She is a true budget hawk in trying to make sure that we ultimately balance this budget. It is tough work to do that.

We have actually, as she mentioned, reduced spending in this bill over last year. Could we reduce it another 1 percent across the board? The problem is we have to choose some priority in the bill.

The highest priority we had was our Nation's defense, the nuclear weapons program. Even though the overall bill is down \$206 million, the defense activities are actually up nearly a billion dollars.

We then have to look at the infrastructure of this Nation and the fact that we have deteriorating infrastructure, and Congress has told us that each year we have to meet what is called the WRDA target. We have to spend with the Army Corps of Engineers to meet the infrastructure of our harbors, dams, and inland waterways and restore those things, because it is very important to our commerce and something the Congress supports greatly.

So when we have had to increase the Army Corps of Engineers funding over what was spent last year and then we have had to increase weapons activity, that means the Department of Energy has been significantly reduced over what they were last year.

We have had to make some very hard choices. We have cut the EERE, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, program in half from \$2 billion to \$1 billion, roughly.

We have had to eliminate the ARPA-E program, a program that I happen to support, but we just don't have the money for it.

We have had to eliminate the loan guarantee program, a program that, again, I support, but we just don't have the money for it.

So we have made some significant reductions while prioritizing basic science research and those types of activities within the Department of Energy. I think we have done a good job, given a pretty skinny budget. We have made tough choices. That is okay. That is what we do all the time in the Appropriations Committee.

The reality is, if we are ever going to balance this budget, if anybody looks at the numbers, right now we are spending about 70 percent of our total Federal budget on mandatory programs. We have been reducing discretionary spending over the years. As a portion of the total budget, it has gone down every year.

If we don't get a hold of mandatory spending—Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, and interest on the debt—within 10 years we will have enough money for our mandatory programs and defense, nothing else—zero.

We are not going to balance this budget by reducing discretionary spending. Keeping control of it, you bet, that is what we have been doing. That is what the Appropriations Committee has been doing since 2010, or earlier. We have actually been reducing spending. It is very important that we do that. But we have to get a hold of mandatory spending if we are going to balance the budget.

So while I appreciate what the gentlewoman is trying to do, I agree with her, we need to balance this budget. We need to balance this budget. Unfortunately, this is not the way to do it.

So I have to oppose this amendment and hope my colleagues would oppose it also.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I will tell you every comment that Mr. SIMPSON made about the mandatory spending is something that I agree with. Yes, we have to do that. But just as we in Congress have reduced our Legislative Branch budget by about 20 percent over the last few years, and just as our Appropriations Committee has done a wonderful job of pulling back on the spending that is done to discretionary, we need to give that same challenge to the bureaucracy, to those rank-and-file Federal employees and challenge them to go save a penny on a dollar out of what they are appropriated. Find a way to yield savings to the work that they do and help us with this process to rein in spending.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage support of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 63 OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 63 printed in House Report 115-259.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division D (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement or enforce the final rule published by the Secretary of Energy entitled "Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedures for Central Air Conditioners and Heat Pumps" published on January 5, 2017 (82 Fed. Reg. 1426).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 473, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to thank the Appropriations Committee for the extraordinary work they have done in a very limited amount of time.

This amendment would prohibit the use of funds to implement or enforce the final rule published by the former Secretary of Energy, entitled: "Test Procedures for Central Air Conditioners and Heat Pumps."

Mr. Chairman, this is simply an example of too much Washington, too much government. I am sure it was well-intended, but I am not sure if the

good idea fairies in Washington really realized fully what they did.

□ 0000

Certainly we want to have test standards and so on and so forth, but the one-size-fits-all approach that comes out of Washington misses some folks and can cause some irreparable damage to businesses all around the country.

And all around the country there are small manufacturers that are trying to build some air-conditioners. In particular, there is one in the district that I represent that builds custom-made air-conditioners and heat pumps for skyscrapers and high-rise buildings.

If I can picture the scene, the original units are put in when the buildings are being constructed. So there are cranes available, there are openings in the walls and in the structure, and they just move the stuff in, and then they close it all up.

In 10, 15, 20, 30 years later when they go to replace it, well, the walls are in, the windows are in, the people are in, the offices are in. There is no crane available, and they have to piece this thing together through the elevator and into the closet. So this company, like other ones around the country, make custom-made ones, each one for a specific application—each one.

But the Department of Energy, and this rule in particular, says that this company must test each model that they make for these efficiency standards—each one—an arduous test taking months, if not years, in documentation for one application.

Again, I am sure the Department of Energy was well-intended. However, this rule is going to put a business out. They work in the city of York, a fine city in central Pennsylvania, right downtown where we want manufacturing to happen, where people can walk to work. These folks are trying. They are struggling to survive in this economy, and the only thing that is going to put them out is this regulation, Mr. Chairman.

While well-intended, it is not going to be helpful. These folks are trying to do the right thing, but the government is getting in the way.

Believe it or not, Consumer Reports actually recommended against buying some of these systems under this testing rule because the systems had higher costs and poor repair records.

Believe it or not, Mr. Chairman, the free market actually fixes most of this stuff. Most of us want to buy more efficient things that are cheaper, that are easier to maintain, and have a better record. This is Consumer Reports talking. This isn't PERRY's record. This is Consumer Reports talking.

Let us not put this company out of business. Let us not put these companies out of business. Let us be responsible. I urge passage.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chair, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to this particular amendment.

I say to the gentleman: For the company in your district, the regulations include the opportunity for waiver. And I would hope that the company in your district would be able to work that out.

The amendment that the gentleman proposes seeks to prohibit the Department of Energy from implementing testing procedures for the energy efficiency standards set for heat pumps and air-conditioners.

I, as the consumer, whether I am buying a heat pump, a furnace, a refrigerator—and every American who now shops looks for those—that is like the sticker. That is what you really look for, and you want to know how much you are going to pay every year for what that product will cost you for energy. And the better product you have, and you are able to put that on a label and it is verified by the Department of Energy, that helps sales.

The original standards that were created were supported and have been supported by the Edison Electric Institute, the association which represents all investor-owned utilities. The amendment, by the way, is opposed by the Air Conditioning, Heating, and Refrigeration Institute, which represents manufacturers of HVAC systems that employ over 1.3 million Americans. And industry opposes the amendment, environmentalists oppose it, because it would cost an average—a cumulative cost to Americans of \$12.2 billion over 30 years.

So there is a lot of opposition to this. It is important to note that these standards were negotiated in a collaborative process by industry groups, environmental nonprofits, and consumer advocates with the Department of Energy. A rider like this one damages the integrity of the negotiated rulemaking process, which is designed to provide certainty and voice to the industry and education and information to consumers.

Test procedures are simple and important. The Department of Energy develops them to make sure companies are rating their product accurately so consumers don't get stuck paying higher bills than they expect, so you know what you buy.

Let's be clear. This amendment would effectively nullify the efficiency standards for heating and cooling systems, in spite of the fact that these standards project that it will save billions of dollars over the period that they are applied, and that is equivalent to having 1 million fewer homes connected to the grid over the same period. It is an enormous savings.

If there is a particular company that is unfairly impacted by these rules, there are outlets for regulatory relief through waivers, as I have mentioned, and this amendment would neuter

those standards and thereby allow cheap imports to undercut American products by exploiting the lack of standards.

We don't want to go back to that. I look for those yellow labels. To protect American manufacturers, to save Americans money on their utility bills, and to reduce air pollution, I strongly oppose this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

The gentleman may have a good intention in offering this amendment, but I don't think you want to take away the benefits to the American people for one company in your district when that company, in fact, can negotiate and receive a waiver. I would just ask my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, we are in agreement that the regulations have to be in place. I, too, like the yellow sticker, just like she does; and somehow the yellow stickers are in place without this new rule. They are there right now. You have been seeing them for years. This is new—this is a new regulation.

I would contend that, yeah, the manufacturers have gotten on board and they have negotiated this rule. Because what choice did they have, right?

The Federal Government is going to regulate. They are going to do it. You either get in the game and play ball or you know what happens to the bat. Right? They didn't want to be in that position, so they took the best they could.

I am telling you and it is my contention that the free market is going to figure this out because we all want the most efficient, the most cost-effective, and the most maintenance-effective, whether it is an air-conditioner, whether it is a car, or whether it is an electric toothbrush.

We don't need the Federal Government telling us to do it. By the way, this company has applied for a waiver, years in the making. They literally have the president of the company spending almost, he said, 85 percent of his time dealing with Federal regulation compliance.

The president of the company is the guy who wants to hire these 125 people, go make sales, and produce things. Instead, all he is doing is dealing with the Federal Government. Somehow, somehow we all got to this point.

It feels pretty cool in the Capitol right now, right? It feels pretty cool in the House of Representatives.

The yellow labels were there before this regulation ever happened.

Mr. Chairman, I ask and urge the Members to vote in favor of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 64 OFFERED BY MR. BUDD

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 64 printed in House Report 115-259.

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY), I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the division D (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce the prevailing wage requirements in subchapter IV of chapter 31 of title 40, United States Code (commonly referred to as the Davis-Bacon Act).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 473, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the Davis-Bacon Act hinders economic growth and increases the Federal deficit. It imposes enormous burdens, stifles contractor productivity, ignores skill differences for different jobs, and imposes rigid craftwork rules.

The Congressional Budget Office has estimated that the Davis-Bacon Act will raise Federal construction costs by \$13 billion between 2015 and 2023.

Now, wages are often set at or above the union scale, despite the fact that only 13 percent of the private construction workforce is even unionized nationwide, Mr. Chairman.

□ 0010

The Davis-Bacon wage determinations have also been known to be lower than the current market rate, which is equally problematic and especially detrimental for local contractors. It is just erratic.

The GAO, the Government Accountability Office, has repeatedly criticized DOL's Davis-Bacon wage determination process for its lack of transparency in the published wage rates and its tendency to gather erroneous data through unscientific wage surveys.

Repealing the DBA would allow the government to build more infrastructure and create 155,000 new construction-related jobs at the very same cost to the taxpayers. In fact, repealing Davis-Bacon would have saved the Federal Government \$10.9 billion, and that was back in 2011.

This amendment would uphold the government's responsibility to deliver

quality infrastructure improvements at the best possible price to the taxpayers, which is certainly what we owe them. It is imperative that all levels of government guarantee the general public that their tax dollars are being spent in the most effective way possible.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY) for his work on this amendment, and I withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 65 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 70 OFFERED BY MR. MITCHELL

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. PERRY). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 70 printed in House Report 115-259.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division D (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to delay the release of the Great Lakes and Mississippi River Interbasin Study (GLMRIS) Brandon Road Study.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 473, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise today as an advocate of the Great Lakes. It is with that spirit I propose my amendment to prevent funds to be used to further delay the release of the Brandon Road Study.

Anyone who has spent time in my home State of Michigan or any of the Great Lakes States knows the beauty and importance of the lakes. In addition to their majesty, the Great Lakes supply 90 percent of the United States freshwater supply. Thirty million people live at the Great Lakes Basin, and they are all impacted by the quality of our lakes, whether as a water source, source of business, recreational opportunity, or the lakes' inherent value as a natural wonder. Any risk to the Great Lakes is a significant problem, no matter how you measure that risk.

One of the threats facing our lakes is the potential entry of invasive species, the most pressing of which, at this time, is the threat of Asian carp entering the Great Lakes.

Asian carp have no natural predators in the lakes, meaning once they enter the Great Lakes, there is no way to stop their spread. Their unrestrained growth would disrupt the entire ecosystem.

In addition to the damage to native wildlife in the lakes, the introduction of Asian carp would damage several multibillion-dollar industries, including the fishing and boating industries which support countless jobs in my

home State of Michigan and the Great Lakes.

Given the threat imposed by invasive species, the Army Corps of Engineers has been studying the best way to prevent introduction of the Asian carp into the Great Lakes Basin. Their study, the Brandon Road Study, was initially slated to be released on February 28 but has been delayed until further notice.

Delaying this study impedes the ability of all interested parties to develop a long-term strategy to thwart this threat. The continued delays create a great risk, yet no reason for delaying that release has been provided.

In late June, a live Asian carp was caught in the Illinois waterway about 2 miles below the T.J. O'Brien Lock and Dam, 9 miles from Lake Michigan. This is the first time an Asian carp has been discovered in such close proximity to our lakes.

Though further study is necessary to determine how this carp entered the area, it is an alarming warning that the window is quickly closing to prevent large-scale devastation to the Great Lakes' ecosystem.

The best way to mitigate the damage of Asian carp in our lakes is to stop it from happening altogether. For several months, members of the Great Lakes Task Force have requested the release of the Brandon Road Study, to no avail. I stand here today to again call on the Army Corps to release the study, which we have already paid for and they have conducted.

My amendment would prevent the Corps from using any more money—our money—to delay the release of the study.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment for the sake of the Great Lakes and for the well-being of our entire region.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, although I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment offered by my friends, Mr. MITCHELL and Mr. HUIZENGA and, I have no doubt, many fellow travelers from the Great Lakes delegation on both sides of the aisle. I find it somewhat unusual that it is the last amendment this evening after midnight. I wish it had come up about 6 o'clock on the evening news.

This is an issue we know well, as Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. MITCHELL, and certainly our chairman, Mr. SIMPSON, has heard a great deal about this now, and our ranking members on the full committee as well.

We introduced a bill last month with the same ultimate effect of preventing

the spread of Asian carp into the Great Lakes. The Great Lakes represent a \$7 billion fishery, deeply threatened by these critters, Asian carp, that shouldn't even be in this country but began their movement up the Mississippi River when they were brought in to do bottom cleaning in Mississippi in the special fish tanks that were set up down there many years ago as bottom feeders. There was some type of storm and they hopped out. The walls were breached, and they began their journey up the Mississippi until now. They are within just a few miles of Lake Michigan.

Just a few weeks ago, a 28-inch Asian carp was caught beyond the protective barriers, which is a temporary solution, only 9 miles from Lake Michigan. Yet, even in this time of greatest danger, the Brandon Road Study, which Congressman MITCHELL outlined, which merely identifies options for preventing Asian carp from reaching the Great Lakes, has not been released by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

This amendment would prevent the administration from expending any more funds to further delay the release of this study for public comment.

My colleagues should know that this study is already completed. After working on it for years at a cost of nearly \$7 million, it now sits on a shelf at the Corps, and they are unwilling to release it for reasons we do not understand.

Asian carp represent a serious economic and environmental threat to the entire Great Lakes. These mean critters are voracious eaters. They destroy native species and overwhelm their new ecosystems. They have gotten into the Ohio River, and they have gotten everything in their sight. They completely upend native ecosystems, and it is truly terrifying what they will do to our lakes, as you can see in this photograph. They are prolific, they are large, and they are predatory.

We should be aggressively pursuing action to prevent the spread of the Asian carp to the Great Lakes, yet the roadmap to getting there is locked in bureaucratic purgatory.

Finally, I would like to point out that this is not a partisan issue. Our substantively similar bill has 15 Republican and 16 Democratic cosponsors, who represent the vast majority of the Great Lakes coastline. In these hyperpartisan times, our constituents are united in their love for the Great Lakes, their desire to protect them, and their understanding of how vital they are to the future of this country and continent.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support for this amendment from all of my colleagues in order to save the national treasures that are the Great Lakes.

Mr. Chairman, I thank Congressman MITCHELL and Congressman HUIZENGA for taking the lead this evening from the great Wolverine State—and we Buckeyes don't often say that, do we—

for embracing what is truly important to all of us, and I urge my colleagues to support the Mitchell-Huizenga amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, while I would like to support this amendment, unfortunately, I can't. But, believe me, I understand and have learned from Ms. KAPTUR and the members of the Great Lakes States when I was chairman of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Subcommittee. And now she sits on the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Subcommittee with me, and they have all come and talked to me about this problem.

This, unfortunately, pits kind of one State against another, and what I am trying to do is find a solution to this, because I happen to agree with these individuals that it seems rather silly that we go out and ask for a report to be done and then can't seem to get it released—not only the final report, we can't even get a draft report released that will go out for comment. That doesn't make any sense to me.

□ 0020

But I know that there are Members who also have concerns about that, but that is, frankly, why you release a draft report, so that you can get the comments.

During full committee consideration on the Energy and Water bill, we discussed a similar amendment that was offered by Ms. KAPTUR, my ranking member, Mr. JOYCE, and Mr. MOOLENAAR; and I committed to them at the time that I would work with all interested parties and Members to try to move these efforts forward, and I am happy to reiterate that commitment now.

What I am asking is if the gentleman will withdraw the amendment, give me a chance, and I commit to try to get this report out, because I think it needs to get done, and I think, together, we can convince the Army Corps and maybe the administration that it needs to get done. So that would be my request.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chair, in deference to Mr. SIMPSON, I will work with him and others in the Great Lakes Legislative Caucus to see if we can't move forward on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time, and I withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr.

MITCHELL) having assumed the chair, Mr. PERRY, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3219) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for

the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 22 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until today, Thursday, July 27, 2017, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2017

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Mark Sanford	5/11	5/14	Greenland		718.00		(³)				718.00
Committee total					718.00						718.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
³ Military air transportation.

HON. DIANE BLACK, Chairman, July 13, 2017.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2017

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Barbara Comstock	4/7	4/10	Egypt		660.77		7,679.14				8,339.91
	4/10	4/10	Lebanon				416.08				416.08
	4/11	4/13	Jordan		826.03		5,915.14				6,741.17
Hon. Lamar Smith	5/11	5/14	Greenland		743.00		(³)				743.00
Hon. Frank Lucas	5/11	5/14	Greenland		743.00		(³)				743.00
Hon. Brian Babin	5/11	5/14	Greenland		743.00		(³)				743.00
Hon. Neal Dunn	5/11	5/14	Greenland		743.00		(³)				743.00
Hon. Ami Bera	5/11	5/14	Greenland		718.00		(³)				718.00
Hon. Jerry McNerney	5/11	5/14	Greenland		718.00		(³)				718.00
Ashley Smith	5/11	5/14	Greenland		718.00		(³)				718.00
Cliff Shannon	5/11	5/14	Greenland		718.00		(³)				718.00
Joseph Brazauskas	5/11	5/14	Greenland		718.00		(³)				718.00
Jennifer Wickre	5/11	5/14	Greenland		718.00		(³)				718.00
Ashlee Vinyard	5/11	5/14	Greenland		718.00		(³)				718.00
Rebekah Eskandani	5/11	5/14	Greenland		718.00		(³)				718.00
Committee total					10,202.80		14,010.36				24,213.16

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
³ Military air transportation.

HON. LAMAR SMITH, Chairman, July 13, 2017.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2086. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Specialty Crops Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's affirmation of interim rule as final rule — Sweet Onions Grown in the Walla Walla Valley of Southeast Washington and Northeast Oregon; Decreased Assessment Rate [Docket No.: AMS-SC-16-0116; SC17-956-1 FIR] received July 24, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2087. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's Selected Acquisition Report for the Army Major Defense Acquisition Programs; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2088. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report entitled "Premarket Approval of Pediatric Uses of Devices — FY 2015"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2089. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Incorporation by Reference of American Society of Mechanical Engineers Codes and Code Cases [NRC-2011-0088] (RIN: 3150-AI97) received July 26, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2090. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's revision 4 of RG 1.20 rule — Comprehensive Vibration Assessment Program for Reactor Internals During Preoperational and Startup Testing [Regulatory Guide 1.20] received July 26, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2091. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's regulatory guide withdrawal — Evaluation of Shipper-Receiver Differences in the Transfer of Special Nuclear Material (Regulatory Guide 5.28, Revision 0); Internal Transfers of Special Nuclear Material (Regulatory Guide 5.49, Revision 0); Shipping and Receiving Control of Strategic Special Nuclear Mate-

rial (Regulatory Guide 5.57, Revision 1) received July 26, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2092. A letter from the Chief Executive Officer, U.S. Anti-Doping Agency, transmitting the Agency's 2016 Annual Report, pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 202(b); Public Law 109-469, Sec. 702(b); (120 Stat. 3534); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2093. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process that was declared in Executive Order 12947 of January 23, 1995, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2094. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 17-016, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) and 36(d) of the